

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

LECTURES
ON THE
COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR
OF THE
SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

London: C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.



Cambridge: DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO.
Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.

LECTURES
ON THE
COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR
OF THE
SEMITIC LANGUAGES

FROM THE PAPERS OF THE LATE

WILLIAM WRIGHT, LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF ARABIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

12312

CAMBRIDGE

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
NEW YORK: MACMILLAN AND CO.

1890

[*All Rights reserved*]

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AND SONS,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

PJ
3021
W8

PREFACE.

THE Lectures printed in this volume were composed and delivered for the instruction of students in the University of Cambridge, and with special reference to the Examination for the Semitic Languages Tripos.

It appears from the *Cambridge University Reporter* that Professor Wright began "a short course of elementary lectures" on the Comparative Grammar of Hebrew, Syriac and Arabic in the Easter Term of 1877, and he continued to lecture on the subject at intervals till he was withdrawn from work by his last illness. The manuscript from which this volume is printed represents the form which the Lectures ultimately assumed, after they had passed through repeated and sedulous revision. They were never redelivered without being retouched, and in parts rewritten; and the whole manuscript, except a few pages at the end, was so carefully prepared as to be practically ready to go to press. It was Professor Wright's intention that the lectures should one day be printed, and during his last illness he often spoke of this intention in such a way as to make it clear that he meant to publish them without any substantial modification or addition. It was not his design to produce a complete system of the Comparative Grammar of the

Semitic Languages or to give a complete account of all recent researches and discussions, but to do through the press for a wider circle of students what he had done by the oral delivery of the lectures for his Cambridge pupils.

Under these circumstances the task of editing the book for publication has been very simple. I have divided the text into chapters, for the convenience of the reader, but have printed it for the most part word for word as it stood in the manuscript. In a very few places I have removed repetitions or other slight inconcinnities of form, but in such cases I have been careful to introduce nothing of my own, and to limit myself to what would certainly have been done by the author's own hand if he had lived to see the book through the press. Occasionally I have thought it necessary to add a few words [within square brackets] to complete a reference or preclude a possible misconception, and I have also added a few notes where the statements in the text seemed to call for supplement or modification in view of facts or arguments which had not yet come under the writer's notice when the lectures were last revised. So long as his health allowed, Professor Wright closely followed all that was done in Semitic learning, and incorporated with his manuscript, from time to time, references to everything that he deemed important for the practical object of the lectures. But it was no part of his plan to give a complete view of the literature of the subject; as a rule he only referred to essays which he wished to encourage his hearers to read in connexion with the lectures. Bearing this in mind, I have been very sparing in the introduction of additional references

to books and papers ; but, on the other hand, I have borne in mind that every written lecture must occasionally be supplemented in delivery by unwritten remarks or explanations, and a few of the notes may be regarded as taking the place of such remarks. I have, for example, occasionally thought it necessary to warn the reader that certain words cited in the text are loan-words. In all questions of phonetics this is a point of importance, and I am informed by those who heard the lectures that Professor Wright was careful to distinguish loan-words as such in his teaching, in cases where the fact is not noted in his manuscript. A considerable number of the notes are due to the suggestion of the author's old and intimate friend Professor Nöldeke, of Strassburg, who has kindly read the lectures in proof, and the notes signed N. or Nöld. are directly taken from his observations. Some of these, which were not communicated to me till the book was in page, have been necessarily placed among the *Additional Notes and Corrections*, to which I desire to call the special attention of the reader.

It will be observed that the Lectures do not embrace any systematic discussion or classification of the forms of nouns in the Semitic languages ; nor can I find any indication that the author intended to add a section on this important and difficult subject. He seems to have regarded it as lying beyond the region that could be conveniently covered in a course of lectures to undergraduates ; and he did not live to read the recent works of his old and valued friend Professor de Lagarde (*Uebersicht über die im Aramäischen, Arabischen und Hebräischen übliche Bildung der Nomina*, Göttingen 1889 : *Abh. der k. G. d. W.*, Bd. xxxv), and of Professor

Barth (*Die Nominalbildung in den Sem. Sprachen*, 1ste Hälfte, i., Leipzig 1889). On the other hand he doubtless intended to complete the subject of verbal inflexion, and I have therefore thought it right to make a few additions to the rough sketch of the derived forms of verbs whose third radical is *l* or *'*, with which the manuscript ended, and also to supply, by way of appendix, a short section on verbs one of whose radicals is an *ſ*. Here also I have derived great advantage from Prof. Nöldeke's suggestions.

The printing of the volume, necessarily slow from the nature of the work, has been still further retarded by a prolonged illness, which fell upon me after the early sheets were printed off, and which would have caused still more delay had not Mr A. Ashley Bevan, of Trinity College, kindly undertaken to read the proofs during my enforced absence from Cambridge. I have to thank Mr Bevan not only for this service but for suggesting several useful notes.

W. ROBERTSON SMITH.

CHRIST'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,

June, 1890.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS. THE TERM SEMITIC. DIFFUSION AND ORIGINAL HOME OF THE SEMITES.	1
<p>The subject 1—Founders of Semitic philology 2—Books recommended 3—Distribution of the Semitic races 4—Their original seat 5.</p>	
CHAPTER II. GENERAL SURVEY OF THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES	10
<p>Northern and southern Semites 10—Northern dialects: Babylonian and Assyrian 12—Aramean group 14—Western and Eastern Aramaic 19—Modern Aramaic dialects <i>ibid.</i>—Canaanites 21—Phoenicians 22—Hittites 23—Hebrews <i>ibid.</i>—Moabites 25—Southern dialects: Arabic 26—Himyaritic 28—Ge'ez or Ethiopic 29—Relation of the Semitic languages to the Indo-European 30—to the Egyptian 33.</p>	
CHAPTER III. SEMITIC WRITING	35
<p>Literature 35—Egyptian origin of the alphabet 36—Oldest monuments of Semitic writing 37—Old Hebrew alphabet of the Siloam inscription 38—Square character 39—Aramaic alphabet <i>ibid.</i>—Alphabets of the southern Semites 40—Inadequacy of the Semitic alphabets 41.</p>	
CHAPTER IV. THE LETTERS OF THE SEMITIC ALPHABET AND THE CHANGES THEY UNDERGO	42
<p>The gutturals 42—The palatals 50—The dentals 52—Aspirated dentals 55—The sibilants 57—The labials 64—The liquids 67—The weak letters <i>w</i> and <i>y</i> 69—Table of permutations 73.</p>	

CHAPTER V. THE VOWELS AND THEIR PERMUTATIONS . . . 75

The original vowel-system 75—Modifications of the vowels in Arabic 76—The short vowels in Hebrew and Aramaic 78—under the influence of the tone in Hebrew 81—The long vowels in Hebrew and Aramaic 84—The diphthongs 87—Supplementary vowels, especially in Hebrew 91—Prosthetic vowels 93.

CHAPTER VI. THE PRONOUNS 95

The personal pronouns: suffix forms 95—Separate forms: 1st person 98—2nd person 101—3rd person 103—The demonstrative pronouns 106—The sign of the definite pronominal accusative 112—The definite article 114—The relative pronouns 116—The Hebrew relative אֲשֶׁר 118—Certain possessive pronouns 119—The interrogative pronouns 120—as indefinites 125—The reflexive pronouns 127—Expression of the reflexive by the aid of substantives 128.

CHAPTER VII. THE NOUN 131

Gender 131—The fem. termination t' (*at*, *ah*) 132—used adverbially 135—with increment (*tē*) 136—Other feminine terminations 138—Cases 139—in Arabic and Ethiopic 140—Traces of case-endings in Hebrew 141—The nouns אִשָּׁה , אִשָּׁה , אִשָּׁה 142—Origin of the case-endings 143—Nunation 143—Mimation 144—Origin of these *ibid.*—The plural 145—The feminine plural 147—Broken plurals 148—The dual 149—Construct dual and plural 151—The feminine plural in Aramaic 152—The emphatic state *ibid.*—Pronominal suffixes to the noun 152.

CHAPTER VIII. THE VERB 161

Nominal forms underlying the inflexion of the verb 161—Intensive forms 162—*Segholates* 163.

I. THE PERFECT 165—Forms with characteristic *a*, *i*, *u* *ibid.*—Inflexion: 3 sing. fem. 167—3 pl. masc. 168—3 pl. fem. 169—Accentuation of 3rd pers. 170—2nd pers. 171—2 sing. masc. *ibid.*—2 sing. fem. 172—2 pl. masc. 173—2 pl. fem. 174—1 sing. 175—1 pl. 177—Dual *ibid.*—Later analogies to the formation of the Perfect 178.

II. THE IMPERFECT 179—3 sing. masc.: the preformative

ya 182—Other preformatives 183—3 sing. fem. 184—3 pl. masc. *ibid.*—3 pl. fem. 185—2 sing. m. and f. *ibid.*—2 pl. m. and f. 186—1 sing. and pl. 187—Dual *ibid.*—Accentuation 188.

III. THE IMPERATIVE 188—Plural 189.

IV. VARIATIONS OF IMPERFECT AND IMPERATIVE 191—Moods of the Imperfect in Arabic *ibid.*—in Hebrew: Jussive forms 192—Energetic forms 193—Moods of the Imperative 195.

V. THE INFINITIVE 195.

VI. THE PARTICIPLES 196—Passive participle 197.

VII. DERIVED CONJUGATIONS. A. *First group* 198—1. The intensive and iterative stem 198—2. The conative stem 202—3. The factitive or causative stems 204—B. *Second group*, Reflexive stems 207—1. Reflexive of the simple stem *ibid.*—2. Reflexive of the intensive 209—3. Reflexive of the conative 212—Infinitives of B. 2 and B. 3 213—4. Reflexive of the causative 214—C. *Third group* (with characteristic syllable *na*) 215—1. Niph'al and its congeners *ibid.*—2. Ethiopic forms with preformative *an* 217—3. Nithpa'el 218—4. Arabic forms with infixed *n* *ibid.*—D. *Fourth group*, Reduplicated stems 218—1. Pi'lēl and its congeners *ibid.*—2. Pe'al'al 219—3. Pilpēl and its congeners 220—4. Arabic Conj. XII. *ibid.*—5. Forms of the type *ḡatlaya* 221—E. *Passive Forms* 222—in Arabic *ibid.*—in Hebrew 223—in Aramaic 224.

CHAPTER IX. THE IRREGULAR VERB 227

I. VERBS y^{y} 227—in Arabic *ibid.*—in Hebrew and Syriac: simple stem 228—Derived conjugations 232.

II. A. VERBS y^{d} AND y^{d} 234—1. Verbs with original *w* as first radical 235—Derived conjugations 239—2. Verbs with *y* as first radical 241.

II. B. VERBS y^{y} AND y^{y} 242—Uncontracted verbs of this class *ibid.*—Contracted forms in Arabic 244—in the other dialects 245—Derived conjugations 251.

II. C. VERBS y^{h} AND y^{h} 255—Perfect of the simple stem *ibid.*—Imperfect 263—Imperative 266—Infinitive 268—Participle 269—Derived conjugations 270.

APPENDIX. Verbs with a radical n 277—A. *Verbs* n^{d} 278—B. *Verbs* n^{y} 282—C. *Verbs* n^{h} 283—History of radical n in Hebrew 284.

ADDITIONAL NOTES AND CORRECTIONS 286

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS. THE TERM SEMITIC. DIFFUSION AND ORIGINAL HOME OF THE SEMITES.

IN commencing a course of Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages, I feel it almost unnecessary to begin with an apology for my subject. The results which may be attained by the comparative treatment of an entire class, or even of a single group of languages, have been patent to all, since the time when men like Bopp, Pott and Schleicher, have investigated the connexion of the Indo-European languages; Jacob Grimm that of the Teutonic; and Diez that of the Romance. What has been done in these fields may yet be accomplished in another; and every attempt to illustrate the history and grammar of the Hebrew language in particular ought to be welcome to its students, even though the results should fail to be in exact conformity with preconceived notions and ancient prejudices.

To myself it is a matter of more importance to apologise for the meagreness of the outline which is all that I can pretend to offer. I have no great discoveries to announce, no new laws to enunciate. The field of our investigations is limited. Instead of ranging from the farthest limits of Hindūstān to the coasts of Ireland, and from the shores of Iceland to the isles of Greece, we are confined, I may say, to a small portion of Western Asia. Our position is that of the Teutonic or Romance philologist rather than that of the Indo-European. The languages with which we have to deal form a small group, which are as intimately connected with one another as old Norse, Gothic, old High German and old English, on the one hand; or as Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Provençal, French and Wallachian, on the

other. And not only this, but I propose to confine myself chiefly to three of these languages—Hebrew, Syriac and Arabic; and to consider these as they appear to us in the ancient forms of their literary monuments, and not, save incidentally, in the modern aspects of their spoken dialects.

You probably infer, then, that our path is a smooth one; that there is not much to investigate; not much room for inquiry or speculation. And yet this is far from being the case. On the contrary, it is surprising how relatively little progress the comparative philology of the Semitic languages has yet made; partly owing to the inherent difficulties of the subject, and partly to the imperfection of our knowledge on many preliminary points of importance.

A hundred years ago the Sanskrit language was barely known to Europeans by name; so recently as 1816 appeared Bopp's *Conjugations-System*, the first work of the great master and founder of the science of Comparative Grammar. And behold, the mustard seed has already grown into a great tree, and has yielded an ample and goodly crop of fruit.

Beside the results of Indo-European philology, those as yet attained by Semitic grammarians seem scant and dwarfish. Since the days of Reuchlin, who died in 1522, we Europeans have been engaged in the study of Hebrew and its sister-languages. The Dutchman De Dieu and the Swiss Hottinger, our own Edmund Castle and the Germans Buxtorf and Ludolf, Alting of Groningen and Danz of Jena, were among those who laid the foundations of our science; and they found worthy successors in the three great Dutch linguists, Schultens, Schroeder and Scheid. But yet the labours of these scholars were not far in advance of those of the classical philologists of their day, who speculated upon the obvious affinities of Latin and Greek, and their connexion with other languages, without being able to arrive at any satisfactory results; simply for want of the proper key wherewith to unlock this linguistic treasury. It was reserved for the men of our own day to take a decided step in advance. Thanks to the studies of a Gesenius and an Ewald, a Roediger and an Olshausen, a Dillmann and a Noeldeke, the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic languages is at last beginning to assume the proportions of a science; and we may therefore hope, before

many years are past, to see the results of their labours embodied in a work which shall not be inferior in fulness and accuracy, I will not say to those of Bopp and Schleicher, but rather to those of Grimm, of Diez, and of Curtius.

You understand, then, that there exists as yet no work which I can recommend to you as a complete text-book of Semitic Comparative Grammar; no treatise which we can confidently follow as a guide from the beginning of our course to its end. The French Orientalist Renan proposed to himself to write such a work; but he has not yet advanced beyond the introduction, the *Histoire Générale des Langues Sémitiques* [8vo, Paris, 1st ed. 1855]. The second part, the *Système Comparé*, has remained, and is now, I fear, likely to remain, a desideratum. Differing as I do from Renan, not merely in small details, but also in various matters of principle, I can still admire the industry and scholarship which are manifest in every page of the *Histoire Générale*; the justice of many of its views, and the clearness of its style and arrangement; and I therefore advise those of you who have not yet read it, to do so without delay, as a good introduction to the studies to which I now invite your attention¹. In connexion with our special course I would recommend to you more particularly the Hebrew Grammar of Justus Olshausen, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache* (Brunswick, 1861); that of B. Stade, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Grammatik*, 1ter Theil (Leipzig, 1879); and Bickell's *Grundriss der Hebräischen Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1869, 70), of which an English translation by Curtiss appeared at Leipzig in 1877 under the title of *Outlines of Hebrew Grammar*. To this little book I shall sometimes have occasion to refer, as I prefer it to Land's *Hebræusche Grammatica* (Amsterdam, 1869), of which there is also an English translation by Reginald Lane Poole, *Principles of Hebrew Grammar* (London, 1876). I would also mention with commendation the latest or 22nd edition of Gesenius' *Hebräische Grammatik*, by Professor Kautzsch of Tübingen, as furnishing some useful hints; [24th ed. Leipzig, 1885].

The term *Semitic* is, as has been often observed, more convenient than scientific. It is not, however, easy to invent a

¹ [See also Nöldeke's article "Semitic Languages" in the ninth ed. of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. xxi. (Edin. 1886).]

better; and it is, at any rate, no worse than "Hamitic," and much superior to "Japhetic" or "Turanian." The word is derived, as you are aware, from the tenth chapter of the Book of Genesis, in which the nations of the world, so far as known to the Jews, are divided into three sections, not, as it would seem, ethnographically, nor even geographically, but with reference to political history and civilisation¹. Thus alone can we satisfactorily explain the mention of the Phoenicians and other Canaanites among the children of Ham. That the languages of Canaan were akin to the Hebrew, almost to identity, is certain; that their connexion with ancient Egyptian was a very remote one, is equally certain—many philologists would deny it altogether; but that Canaan and the Phoenicians were long subject to Egypt, and that they derived a great part of their civilisation from the Egyptians, are historical facts which do not admit of dispute.

The Semitic races occupy but a small portion of the earth's surface. They are known to us historically as the inhabitants of the south-western corner of Asia. Their territory is bounded on the north by Mount Taurus and the mountains of Armenia; on the east, by the mountains of Kurdistan and Khūzistān, and the Persian Gulf; on the south, by the Indian Ocean; and on the west, by the Red Sea and the Mediterranean. Early colonisation led them across the strait of Bāb el-Mandeb into the country which we call Abyssinia; and they also occupied, at an extremely remote period, various points on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea and even of the Atlantic Ocean, the trading ports of the energetic Phoenician race.

If you ask me whether the Semites were autochthones,—whether they were the original, primitive inhabitants of the Asiatic region above described,—I must beg of you to formulate the question differently.

It seems certain, on the evidence of ancient monuments, that the great basin of the Tigris and Euphrates was originally occupied by a non-Semitic people or peoples, of no mean civilisation, the inventors of the cuneiform system of writing. Hebrew tradition, as contained in the Old Testament, mentions

¹ See Tiele, *Vergelijkende Geschiedenis van de Egyptische en Mesopotamische Godsdiensten* [8vo, Amsterdam, 1872], p. 20.

various gigantic tribes as the primitive inhabitants of Palestine (הַנְּפִלִיִּים בְּאֶרֶץ, 1 Chron. vii. 21), such as the Emūm, הָאֵמִים, Nēphilim, הַנְּפִילִים, Rēphā'im, רֶפְאִים, 'Anākīm, הָעֲנָקִים, Zūzīm, הַזּוּזִים, and Zamzummīm, זַמְזוּמִּים; the Hōrīm or Troglodytes, הַהֲרִים, and others; some of whom at least were probably non-Semitic.

It appears then that in certain parts of their territory the Semites were not autochthones, but a foreign conquering race. Was this the case with the whole Semitic region? Does the cradle of the Semites lie within the boundaries designated above, or outside of them? That is the shape which your question should take.

Here, on the very threshold of our inquiries, the opinions of the best modern authorities diverge widely, some maintaining (as I myself was formerly inclined to do) that the Semites were ancient immigrants from the North East; others that their home was in the South, whence they gradually overspread the whole of Syria and Mesopotamia by successive migrations in a northerly direction. In recent times the former view has been upheld, to mention only a very few names, by von Kremer, Guidi, and Hommel; the latter by Sayce, Sprenger, Schrader, and De Goeje.

It was in 1875 that von Kremer published in a German periodical called *Das Ausland* (nos. 1 and 2) two articles on "Semitische Culturentlehnungen aus dem Pflanzen- und Thierreiche," i.e. on plants and animals which the Semites obtained, with their names, from other races. His conclusions, so far as they interest us at the present moment, are briefly these. Before the formation of the different Semitic dialects, they had a name for the camel, which appears in all of them; whereas they have no names in common for the date-palm and its fruit, or for the ostrich. The one the Semites knew while they were as yet one people, dwelling together; the others they did not know. Now the region where there is neither date-palm nor ostrich, and yet where the camel has been known from the remotest antiquity, is the great central tableland of Asia, near the sources of the Oxus and Jaxartes, the Jaihūn and Saihūn. Von Kremer regards the

Semitic emigration from this region as having preceded the Aryan or Indo-European, perhaps under pressure from the latter race; and he holds that the Semites first settled in Mesopotamia and Babylonia, which he looks upon as the oldest centre of Semitic civilisation. "In der babylonisch-mesopotamischen Niederung, wo die Semiten sich angesammelt hatten, entstand das erste und älteste semitische Culturcentrum."

In 1879 the Italian orientalist Ignazio Guidi wrote a memoir upon the primitive seat of the Semitic peoples, "Della sede primitiva dei popoli Semitici," which appeared among the publications of the Reale Accademia dei Lincei. His line of argument is much the same as von Kremer's (whose articles appear to have been unknown to him). Comparing the words in the various Semitic languages which express the configurations of the earth's surface, the varieties of soil, the changes of the seasons and climate, the names of minerals, plants and animals, etc., Guidi arrives at nearly the same conclusions as von Kremer, viz. (1) that Babylonia was the first centre of Semitic life, "siamo sempre riportati alla Babilonide come centro degli antichissimi Semiti (p. 48)"; and (2) that these primitive Semites were immigrants from the lands to the S. and S.W. of the Caspian Sea, which he regards as "probabile punto di partenza degli antenati dei Semiti (p. 51)."

In the same year, 1879, Hommel wrote a paper on this subject, which I do not possess in its original shape. His conclusion, however, is nearly identical with that of von Kremer and Guidi, that lower Mesopotamia, and not Arabia, was the original seat of the Semites. You will find his views stated briefly, with some slight polemic against von Kremer, in his book *Die Namen der Säugethiere bei den Südsemitischen Völkern* [Leipzig, 1879], p. 406 sqq. Consult also his later work, *Die Semitischen Völker u. Sprachen*, 1883, especially p. 63.

Assuming for the moment the correctness of this view,—taking it for granted that the Semites first settled as one race in Mesopotamia and Babylonia,—how are we to depict to ourselves their dispersion over the territory which they subsequently occupied? Somewhat as follows:—

Having forced their way through the mountainous region of Kurdistan, and reached the Tigris, the Semites would cross it

and settle in the country between the Tigris and Euphrates. Thence they would gradually make their way southwards by two different lines, through what we call Syria and Babylonia. The one branch would extend its wanderings as far as Canaan; the other to the head of the Persian Gulf, where in process of time they would cast off a fresh swarm, which occupied Arabia and then crossed over into Africa. All this of course is supposed to happen in pre-historic times; as Guidi says, "tale parmi che possa essere stato il movimento preistorico di questi popoli."

Let us now consider the opposite view, which I am at present strongly inclined to adopt.

The plainest statement of it in English is that of Sayce in his *Assyrian Grammar* (1872), p. 13: "The Semitic traditions all point to Arabia as the original home of the race. It is the only part of the world which has remained exclusively Semite. The racial characteristics—intensity of faith, ferocity, exclusiveness, imagination—can best be explained by a desert origin."

Similarly Sprenger in his *Alte Geogr. Arabiens* (Bern, 1875), p. 293: "All Semites are according to my conviction successive layers of Arabs. They deposited themselves layer upon layer; and who knows, for example, how many layers had preceded the Canaanites, whom we encounter at the very beginning of history?" "Alle Semiten sind nach meiner Ueberzeugung abgelagerte Araber. Sie lagerten sich Schichte auf Schichte, und wer weiss, die wie viele Schichte zum Beispiel die Kanaaniter, welche wir zu Anfang der Geschichte wahrnehmen, waren?"

Schrader expresses views of the same nature in an article in the *ZDMG.* for 1873, vol. xxvii. pp. 397—424. After a long discussion of the religious, linguistic and historico-geographical relations of the different Semitic nations to one another, he arrives at the conclusion that Arabia is the home of these races: "Die Erwägung der religiös-mythologischen, weiter der linguistischen, nicht minder der allgemein geschichtlich-geographischen Verhältnisse, weist uns nach Arabien als den Ursitz des Semitismus" (p. 421).

Lastly, De Goeje in his academical address for 1882, *Het Vaderland der Semietische Volken*, has distinctly declared himself

¹ [The same view is already expressed and defended in Sprenger's *Leben und Lehre des Mohammad*, Bd i. (Berlin, 1869), p. 241 sq.]

in favour of the view that Central Arabia is the home of the Semitic race as a whole. Laying it down as a rule without exception that mountaineers never become inhabitants of the steppe and nomade shepherds, De Goeje rejects the notion that the Semites can have descended from the mountains of the Arrapachitis to become dwellers in the plains and swamps of Babylonia. On the other hand he shews how nomades are continually passing over into agriculturists with settled habitations; how villages and towns are gradually formed, with cultivated lands around them; and how the space needful for the pasturing nomade is thus gradually curtailed until the land becomes too narrow for him and he is forced to seek a home elsewhere. So it fared with Central Arabia. The result was that the nomade population was incessantly overstepping its bounds in every direction, and planting itself in Syria, Babylonia, 'Omān, or Yaman. Successive layers of emigrants would drive their predecessors in Syria and Babylonia farther northwards towards the borders of Kurdistān and Armenia, and thus the whole of Mesopotamia would be gradually semitised, and even portions of Africa would in course of time more or less completely share the same fate. This process, I may remark, has often been repeated in more recent, historical times, in which the Arab migration has overflowed the whole of Syria and Mesopotamia. In the earliest centuries of the Christian era, the wealthy city of Palmyra was ruled, I may say, by a company of Arab merchants. Three petty kingdoms, those of Ghassān, of the Tha'labites, and of al-Hīrah, divided between them the southern part of the Syrian steppe; and in the struggles between the Byzantine and Persian empires the Arabs of Mesopotamia had always to be reckoned with, and yielded a reluctant obedience to the one side or the other. De Goeje also lays stress upon the fine climate of Central Arabia and the splendid physical and mental development of the race; and, like Schrader, compares their language with those of the other Semites in the earliest stage at which we know them, drawing the inference that the speech of the Arabs is the nearest approximation that we can have to the primitive Semitic tongue. "En dat van alle Semietische talen het Arabisch het naast staat aan de moedertaal, waaruit zij gesproken zijn, is overtuigend bewezen door hoogleeraar Schrader te Berlijn (p. 16)."

This view is of course diametrically opposed to that of Sayce, who claims for the Assyrian "the same position among the Semitic tongues that is held by Sanskrit in the Aryan family of speech." Which of these scholars is in the right we shall be better able to judge by and by. Meanwhile I will only say that I range myself on the Arabic side with Schrader and De Goeje.

Accepting this view of the cradle of the Semites,—assuming that they spread from Arabia as their centre,—how shall we depict to ourselves their dispersion over the Semitic territory? Let Schrader speak. He imagines the northern Semites—i.e., the Arameans, Babylonians and Canaanites—to have parted in a body from their brethren in the south, and to have settled in Babylonia, where they lived together for a long period. The Arameans would be the first to separate from the main body of emigrants; at a considerably later period the Canaanites; last of all the Assyrians. At the same time an emigration would be going on in a southerly direction. Leaving the northern Arabs in Central Arabia, these emigrants would settle on the southern coast of the peninsula, whence a band of them subsequently crossed the sea into Africa and pitched in Abyssinia¹.

¹ [On all these theories of the cradle of the Semitic race see also Nöldeke's remarks in *Enc. Brit.* xxi. 642. He himself suggests, "not as a definite theory but as a modest hypothesis," that the primitive seat of the Semites is to be sought in Africa, though he regards the Arabian theory as "not untenable." It may be observed that, if the Semites originally came from Africa, Arabia may yet be the centre from which they spread over other parts of Asia.]

CHAPTER II.

GENERAL SURVEY OF THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

I NOW proceed to give you a more detailed account of the several languages, or groups of languages, which constitute the Semitic family. I divide them broadly into the *northern* Semites and the *southern* Semites. By the former I understand the Arameans, the Canaanites and Hebrews, the Babylonians and Assyrians; by the latter, the northern Arabs, the southern Arabs or Himyarites, and the Ge'ez or Abyssinians. In the course of my description it may, perhaps, be better to follow a geographical than a historical arrangement; for this reason, that linguistic and political history are very different things; that one nation may have played its part in the world's history, and have disappeared from the stage, long before a kindred people has come prominently into notice; and yet, from a linguistic point of view, the language of the latter may exhibit their common speech in a more antique phase, and may prove in the hands of the comparative philologist a more efficient implement than that of the former. An example of what I mean is afforded us by the Icelandic, which among all the existing Teutonic dialects has retained the greatest number of original forms with the least alteration. Another and still better instance is the Lithuanian language. It is spoken by only a couple of millions of people (at most) on the borders of Prussia and Russia; its earliest written literary document dates from the middle of the sixteenth century; and yet it has preserved many of the forms of Indo-European speech in a less corrupted condition than any of its European congeners, aye, than any dialect of the entire family which is not at least two thousand years older.

The causes which produce results such as these are, probably, manifold; but some of them at any rate are, as it seems to me,

sufficiently clear. Language is after all, as Whitney has remarked, the work of tradition ; we speak as we were taught by our fathers and mothers, who were in their turn trained by a preceding generation. This process of transmission is always, and necessarily, more or less imperfect. Hence language is always undergoing a process of modification, partaking of the nature both of decay and of growth. The less imperfect the transmission, the slighter will the modification obviously be. Now two circumstances above all others are favourable to the continuity and completeness of linguistic tradition: isolation is the one ; the possession of a literature is the other. If a race, speaking a single language, occupies a circumscribed territory, so long as that race is confined within those narrow limits, and thrown but little into contact with surrounding races, the forces which produce linguistic decay and growth are, if not entirely repressed, at least limited in their operation. Dialectic differences will probably arise, but they will be comparatively few and trifling. On the other hand, if the said race extends its territory largely, by conquest or colonisation, and is thrown into constant contact or collision with other races, the decay and growth of its speech proceeds with greatly accelerated rapidity ; and the language runs no small risk of being ultimately broken up into several languages, the speakers of which are no longer mutually intelligible. Here the possession of a literature steps in as a counteracting force, exercising a strong conservative influence. English, as is well known, has changed less since Shakespear's time than it did in the interval between him and Chaucer ; and certainly much less since Chaucer's age than it did during the five preceding centuries. So too with Arabic. As long as the Arabs were confined within the limits of their peninsula, the variations of their speech were but small. We know indeed of dialectic differences, but they are neither numerous nor important. The words and names handed down to us from antiquity as Arabic,—whether in the cuneiform inscriptions, the Bible, or the writers of Greece and Rome,—are easily recognisable as such, unless when they have undergone corruption in the course of transmission. Since Muḥammad's time, however, the changes have been more rapid and numerous ; and by this time the natives of Syria, Egypt, and Morocco, would perhaps have

been scarcely intelligible to one another, had it not been for the link of a common literature, commencing with the ancient poets and the *Qur'ān*. The existence of this link has greatly retarded the processes of growth and decay; and hence it happens that the Arabic of the present day is a far closer representative of the language as spoken, say, two thousand years ago, than modern Italian and French are of the Latin of the same period.

We commence, then, our survey of the Semitic tongues with the *Northern* section, and herein with the *Eastern* group, which, as it happens, is the first to appear prominently in the field of history. This group comprises two very closely allied languages, the Babylonian and Assyrian, which have been preserved to us in numerous inscriptions, written in cuneiform or wedge-shaped characters. The earliest of these inscriptions go back beyond the time of the Babylonian king *Hammurabi*, who cannot, according to the best authorities, have flourished later than circa 1500 B.C.; and the latest come down to the beginning of the fourth century B.C., when the Persian monarch *Artaxerxes Mnemon* reigned¹. They are all written, unfortunately for us, in a non-Semitic character, primitively hieroglyphic, and of peculiar complexity, one of the varieties of the cuneiform type. Into a full description of these, and the history of their decipherment, so far as it has till now been accomplished, I cannot here enter. The Assyrian character, as I shall call it for shortness' sake, is not alphabetical, but syllabaric. Such syllables as *ka*, *ki*, *ku*, *ak*, *ik*, *uk*, are each expressed by a single sign, as well as syllables of the form *kam*, *kim*, *sak*, *sik*. These latter compound syllables may, however, be also denoted by two signs, the one indicating a syllable which ends with a certain vowel, and the other a syllable which begins with the same vowel; e.g. *ka-am*, *si-ik*. Under these circumstances alone, the learning to read Assyrian texts with fluency would be no light task; but the difficulty is enormously enhanced by the fact that a great number of the signs employed in writing are not syllables but ideograms; not phonetic signs, but characters denoting an object or idea. Some of these ideograms have no phonetic value whatever; whilst others are both ideographic and have a phonetic

¹ [The Br. Mus. has an inscr. of *Antiochus I.*, *Soter*, of the year 269 B.C.]

value as well. For instance $\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright\blacktriangledown$ as a syllable sounds *an*, but as an ideogram it means "God," *ilu*, which is otherwise written phonetically with two signs, *i-lu*. One class of ideograms are mere determinatives, their object being solely to indicate the nature of the following group of signs; e.g. \blacktriangledown before every name of a man, $\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleright$ before most names of countries, etc.

How much perplexity is caused by the intermixture of these ideograms with the phonetic signs you can easily conceive; and that the Assyrians themselves found a difficulty herein is obvious from their use of what is called "the phonetic complement." This consists in the addition to an ideogram of one or two phonetic signs, indicating the termination of the word denoted by the ideogram. For example, a certain combination of wedges sounds KI; but as an ideogram it means "the earth." Consequently the phonetic complement *tiv* is added to it, to lead the reader to the correct pronunciation, which is not *ki-tiv*, but *irši-tiv* (אַרְשִׁי). Two ideograms, the phonetic values of which are SU-AS, mean "I burned." Now in Assyrian the idea of "burning" is expressed by *sarap*, *isrup* (שָׂרַף), or *kavā*, *ikvā* (כָּוָה). Consequently, when the 1st pers. sing. imperf. of the former verb is intended, the syllable *up* is added to the ideograms SU-AS, and the whole word, though written SU.AS.*up*, is pronounced *asrup*. We do something of this kind ourselves, but on a very limited scale, when we write LSD, and read "pounds, shillings and pence"; or write & and *i.e.* and *viz.*, and pronounce "and" and "that is" and "namely." The Persians made more use of the same procedure in writing the Pahlavī character. Using a strange jumble of Semitic and Persian, they wrote *lhmā* and *bsrā* [i.e. the Aramaic *lahmā*, "bread"; *besrā*, "flesh"], but spoke *nān* and *gōsht*; they wrote *ab* and read *pī*t ["father"], but *abit*r did duty for [the synonym] *pī*tār.

To return to the Assyrian. A yet greater difficulty lies ahead of the decipherer than any of those already mentioned; for it seems to have been established that some at least both of the syllabic signs and of the ideograms are polyphonic, that is, have several different sounds and significations.

For further details and explanations I must refer you to the works of Ménant, Smith, Oppert, Sayce and Schrader, espe-

cially the treatise of the last-named scholar in the *ZDMG.*, vol. xxvi. pp. 1—392; Sayce, *An Assyrian Grammar for comparative purposes*, 1872; *An Elementary Grammar of the Assyrian Language*, in "Archaic Classics," 1875 (2nd ed. 1877)¹. The researches of these and other writers, such as Rawlinson, Hincks and Norris, not to mention younger scholars, such as Delitzsch, Haupt and Hommel, have rendered it clear that the language of the Assyrian and Babylonian empires, as handed down to us in this particular variety of cuneiform writing, was a member of the North Semitic group, closely connected with Phœnician and Hebrew, and only in a somewhat less degree with Aramaic.

As I shall not often refer hereafter to the Assyrian tongue, I may take this opportunity of stating that, in regard to its vowels, the Assyrian seems to have preserved more than the Hebrew of that ancient simplicity which is so conspicuous in the Arabic. It appears to possess only the three radical vowel sounds *a, i, u*, a fact which need not surprise us, if we look to the written vocalisation of the Arabic and to the analogy of Sanskrit in the Indo-European family². In respect to its consonants, however, the Assyrian approaches more nearly to the lower level of the Phœnician and Hebrew, as contrasted with the higher level of the Arabic. This is especially obvious in regard to the sibilants, as "three," *šalašti*, שָׁלֹשׁ, ثَلَاث; "manly," *zikaru*, זִכָּר, ذَكَر. Some salient and distinctive features in its grammar we may have occasion to notice from time to time; and I therefore only remark in conclusion that this eastern branch of the North Semitic languages has left no modern representative whatever.

Proceeding northward and westward, we meet with the great *Aramean* or *central* group of the North Semitic dialects.

The Bible has made you familiar with the name of *Arām* (written אֲרָם, constr. אֲרָם, for which we should rather have expected אֲרִם, agreeably to the analogy of דְּבָר, דְּבַר). It speaks of אֲרָם דְּמֹשֶׁק or "the Aram of Damascus," אֲרָם צוֹבָה,

¹ [See also Lyon, *Assyrian Manual* (Chicago, 1886); Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gr.* (Berlin, 1889).]

² [But Haupt (*Amer. Journ. of Philol.* viii. (1887), p. 265 *sqq.*) and Delitzsch maintain the existence of *e* in Assyrian.]

אַרַם מַעֲנַה, etc., all places situated in Syria. אַרַם נְהָרַיִם, "Aram of the two rivers," is usually supposed to mean *Mesopotamia*, but it is possible that the two rivers were not the Euphrates and Tigris, but the Euphrates and its chief affluent the Chabōras or Khābūr, which would limit the designation to the western half of what is generally understood by Mesopotamia. A part of this territory bore the name of פֶּרֶן אַרַם, which we may probably identify with the village of هَرْبَن, called by the Arab geographers فَدَّان [Faddān], near Ḥarrān. *Arām* seems, therefore, not to be a geographical or political designation, but the ancient name of the race, which they brought with them in their wanderings from the banks of the lower Tigris, the district known in the time of the Sāsānians, and even later, as بֵּית אֲרַמְיָא [Beth Armāyē], or "the home of the Arameans." Now the Jews, as is well known, employed the word אֲרַמִּי (אַרְמִי) in the sense of "gentile," "heathen"; and under the influence of their usage, it was retained by the Syrian translators of the New Testament to express Ἕλληνες, ἔθνικοί, and similar words. But a term which was used in the Bible to designate "heathens" could no longer be borne by a Christian people. Hence the old name was modified into אֲרַמְיָא [Ārāmāyā]; but even this was gradually discarded and replaced by another, the Greek designation of "Syrians." This is merely an abbreviation of "Assyrians." At first the Greeks called all the subjects of the Assyrian empire Ἀσσύριοι, or more usually by the shorter form Σύριοι or Σύροι. Subsequently, as they became better acquainted with these regions, they used the fuller form Ἀσσυρία to designate the lands on the banks of the Tigris, whilst the shorter form Συρία served as the name of the western lands; and at last this term was adopted by the Arameans themselves, who as Christians applied to themselves the term سُوْرْيَا [Suryāyē]. See Noeldke in *Hermes* for 1871, p. 443, and in *ZDMG.* xxv. 113.

From its northern settlements the Aramean race gradually extended itself over the whole of Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia; and its language is consequently known to us in various forms, attaining their literary development at different periods.

Firstly, there is the dialect of northern Mesopotamia, specifically of the district around Orhāi (Urhōi) or Edessa, which we commonly call Syriac. It is known to us as a literary language from about the second century after Christ down to the thirteenth or fourteenth. The best grammars of it for our purpose are those of Noeldeke [Leipzig, 1880] and Duval [Paris, 1881].

Secondly, there are the dialects of Syria Proper and of Palestine, the region to the west of the Euphrates. These are usually spoken of by the absurd designation of *Chaldee*, which would properly mean something very different, as we have seen above. Leaving out of account two words in the book of Genesis (ch. xxxi. 47) and a verse in Jeremiah (ch. x. 11), the oldest literary monuments of this branch of Aramaic are certain passages in the book of Ezra (ch. iv. 8—vi. 18, vii. 12—26), going back to the end of the sixth or the beginning of the fifth century B.C., which are, as Renan says, really specimens of the Aramaic of the time of Darius Hystaspis, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes Longimanus¹. About the Aramaic portions of the book of Daniel there is a doubt, for they are, according to the best foreign critics, of much later date, having been written by a Palestinian Jew in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, about 166 or 165 B.C. This point, however, is one which I am not called upon to settle, and I content myself with merely indicating the doubt. Then follow the Biblical Targūms, Onkelos, Jonathan, Pseudo-Jonathan, and the Yērūshalmī. Now, do not for a moment suppose that the Jews lost the use of Hebrew in the Babylonian captivity, and brought back with them into Palestine this so-called Chaldee. The Aramean dialect, which gradually got the upper hand since the fourth or fifth century B.C., did not come that long journey across the Syrian desert; it was *there*, on the spot; and it ended by taking possession of the field, side by side with the kindred dialect of the Samaritans, as exemplified in their Targūm of the Pentateuch, their festal services and hymns. For the grammati-

¹ [See however Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, 2nd ed. (Leiden, 1887) vol. i. p. 502 *sq.*, where the view is taken that the author of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah made extracts from an Aramaic work: this work may have been written in the Persian period, and it contained authentic history, but the documents it cites are not literally authentic. Upon this view the language of the Aramaic portions of Ezra is not so old as Renan supposes.]

cal study of the Biblical Aramaic I recommend to you the grammar of S. D. Luzzatto, *Elementi grammaticali del caldeo biblico e del dialetto talmudico-babilonense*, which has been translated into German by Krüger (Breslau 1873) and into English by Goldammer, rabbi at Cincinnati (New York, 1876). The works of Winer and Petermann may also be named. The former has been done into English by Riggs and by Longfield. Turpie's Manual (1879) may be found convenient; but Kautzsch's *Grammatik des Biblisch-aramäischen* (Leipzig, 1884) is the best in its particular field. The best Samaritan grammars are those of Uhlemann (Leipzig, 1837), and Petermann (Berlin, 1873). That of Nicholls may also be mentioned.

Subordinate dialects of this second class are:—

(a) The Egyptian Aramaic, as exhibited, for example, in the stele of Saḫkāra, now in the Berlin Museum¹; in the inscription preserved at Carpentras in France²; in the papyri Blacassiani, formerly in the collection of the Duc de Blacas, now in the British Museum³; and the papyrus of the Louvre edited by the Abbé Bargès⁴. The Berlin stele is dated in the fourth year of Xerxes, B.C. 482. The other monuments specified, and a few more of the same class, may perhaps be ascribed, as M. Clermont-Ganneau maintains⁵, to the periods of Persian sway in Egypt, B.C. 527 to 405 and B.C. 340 to 332; but it is possible that some of them at any rate may be of later date, the work of Jews dwelling in Egypt.

(b) The Nabathean dialect, or that of inscriptions found in Ḥaurān, Petra, and the Sinaitic Peninsula, as well as at Taimā and Madāin Ṣāliḥ or al-Iljir in North Arabia. The great inscription of Taima⁶ is of the Persian period and therefore some centuries anterior to the Christian era. The inscriptions discovered by Doughty at Madāin Ṣāliḥ, and just published by the French Academy⁷, date from B.C. 3 to

¹ [Figured and published in the Palaeographical Society's *Oriental Series*, Plate lxiii.]

² [*Ibid.* Plate lxiv.]

³ [*Ibid.* Plates xxv., xxvi.]

⁴ [*Papyrus égypto-araméen*, Paris, 1862.]

⁵ [*Revue Archéologique* 1878, 79, xxxvi. 93 sqq., xxxvii. 21 sqq.]

⁶ [Published by Nöldeke in *Sitzungsab. d. k. Pr. Acad. zu Berlin*, 10 July, 1884.]

⁷ [*Documents épigraphiques*, &c., 4° Paris, 1884; now superseded for most of the inscriptions by Euting's *Nabatäische Inschriften aus Arabien*, 4° Berlin, 1885.]

A.D. 79¹. The Sinaitic inscriptions are certainly not of earlier date, whatever the Rev. Ch. Forster may have written to the contrary².

(c) The dialect of the inscriptions found at Tadmor or Palmyra, a large collection of which has been published by the Comte de Vogüé in his work *Syrie Centrale, Inscriptions Sémitiques*, 4to, Paris, 1868—77, on which Noeldeke has based his admirable article in the *ZDMG.*, vol. xxiv., p. 85. They range from 9 B.C. to the latter part of the third century of our era. Since De Vogüé's publication considerable additions have been made to our stock, notably one large bilingual inscription in three columns, containing a tariff of taxes and imposts on merchandise of various sorts³.

(d) The dialect spoken by the Christians of Palestine, the principal literary monument of which is a Lectionary, edited by the Count Miniscalchi-Erizzo under the misleading title of *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum* [4to, Verona, 1861, 64], since there is nothing to connect it specially with Jerusalem. The remaining relics of this literature have been collected by Land in the fourth volume of his *Anecdota Syriaca* [4to, Lugd. Bat. 1875]. They comprise portions of the Old and New Testaments, hymns and fragments of theological writings. The grammar of this dialect has been written by Noeldeke in the *ZDMG.*, vol. xxii. p. 443. The extant MSS. of the lectionary belong to about the eleventh century, but as a spoken language this dialect was probably extinct several centuries before that time.

The third and last subdivision of the Aramean branch comprehends the dialects which occupied the Assyrian mountains and the plains of al-'Irāk. Of the former, so far as ancient times

¹ [These are the dates given by the French academicians. The inscription which they assign to B.C. 3 (Doughty 7 = Euting 12) is really, according to Euting's more perfect copy, of the fortieth year of Ḥārithat IV. = A.D. 31. But Euting 1 (which was not in Doughty's collection) dates from the first year of this king, so that the series begins in B.C. 9. Again the inscription of the fourth year of Rab'el (Euting 28 = Doughty 19), which the academicians place in A.D. 79, is assigned by Euting with more probability to A.D. 75. The date of king Rab'el depends on the reading of the inscription of Ḍmēr, published by Sachau in *ZDMG.* xxxviii. (1884) p. 535.]

² [Euting has copies of dated Sinaitic inscriptions of the 3rd Christian cent.]

³ [Published by De Vogüé in *Journal Asiatique*, Ser. 8, t. i. ii. (1883). See also *ZDMG.* xxxvii. 562 sqq., and xlii. 370 sqq., where the literature is fully cited.]

are concerned, we know little or nothing. Of the latter, to which Arab writers apply the name Nabathean (نَبَاطِي or نَبْطِي), the older representative is the language of the Babylonian Talmūd (exclusive of certain portions, which are written in late Hebrew). Its more modern representative, which has only died out as a spoken language within the last few centuries, is the Mandaitic, the dialect of the Mandeans or Gnostics (מַנְדַּאִיִּיא), otherwise called Ṣābians (i.e. "Washers," from their frequent ablutions and washings, الصَّابِنُونَ, rad. צָבַע = צָבַע, or المَغْتَسِلَة) and, though very absurdly, St John's Christians. A miserable remnant of this race still lingers in Chūzistān [and near Baṣra], where they have been visited by Petermann and other recent travellers; but even their priests seem now to understand but little of their Aramaic dialect. Our MSS. of their religious works are all modern, the oldest in Europe being of the sixteenth century. The grammar of this dialect too has been written by the indefatigable Noeldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, Halle, 1875.

All these Aramean dialects may be divided into two classes, which are readily distinguishable by the form of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. of the Imperfect. In the western dialects—Biblical Aramaic, the Targūms, the Samaritan, the Egyptian Aramaic, the Nabathean, the Palmyrene, and the Christian dialect of Palestine—the prefix of this person is *yodh*, יִקְטֹל; whereas in the eastern dialects—at least in Syriac—it is *nun*, نִקְטֹל. The usage of the Babylonian Talmūd and the Mandaitic appears to fluctuate between *n* and *l*, though *nūn* preponderates in the latter. The form with *l* appears occasionally in Biblical Aramaic, and very rarely in the Targūms, but it is restricted to the verb (לִהְיוֹן, לִהְיוֹן, or לִהְיוֹן) הוּא.

Each of these two classes of Aramaic dialects has its modern representative. Around the village of Ma'lūlā, among the hills a short distance N.N.E. of Damascus, Syriac is still spoken, more by the women and children than by the men of the locality. The prefix of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. Imperf. is *yōdh*, and this dialect therefore represents the Western Aramaic. For instance:

parkin, "I will save," he uses a Pa^{al} participle active, with the loss of the initial *m*, **ܕܒܝܬ** *bit* being a contraction of **ܕܒܝܬܐ** [*it is required that*], and **ܡܢܝܝܬ** standing for **ܡܢܝܝܬܐ** [*saving be I*]. But when he says **ܕܒܝܬܐ ܡܢܝܝܬܐ** *purkit li*, "I have saved thee," he employs a Pu^{al} participle, **ܡܢܝܝܬܐ** being a contraction of **ܡܢܝܝܬܐ**, so that the literal meaning is "thou hast been saved by me." The original form **ܡܢܝܝܬܐ** is of course identical with the Hebrew **מִנְיָן, מְנַרְךְ, מְפָרֵשׁ**, and quite distinct from the old Syriac and Arabic passive participles **مَنْقَل, مَمْلَأ**. These Neo-Syriac dialects have been largely illustrated of late years by the publications of Socin and Prym, of Merx, and of Duval¹.

I pass on from the Central or Aramaic to the next great division of the Semitic family, the *Western*, the members of which inhabited the narrow strip of land on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, from the mouth of the Orontes southwards.

Here we have two different, though kindred, layers of population to deal with.

(1) The *Canaanites*, under which term we include the Bēnē Hēth or Hittites, the Amorites, Jebusites, and some other tribes frequently mentioned in Scripture in close connexion with one another, and the Phoenicians of the seacoast. The Philistines, who occupied part of the south of Palestine and afterwards gave their name to the whole country, I purposely exclude for the present, as being *ἀλλόφυλοι*, of a yet uncertain race, though not improbably Semitic.

Just as the various Aramean tribes called themselves **אַרַם**, so these Canaanites called themselves by the common name of *Xvâ*, i.e. **כְּנַעַן**. Stephanus Byzantius says that *Xvâ* was an old name for Phoenicia; Sanchuniathon, [Philo Byblius, ap. Euseb. *Pr.*

¹ [Prym and Socin, *Der neu-aram. Dialect des Tūr 'Abdīn*, Gött. 1881; Socin, *Die neu-aram. Dialecte von Urnīa bis Mosul*, 4^o Tüb. 1882 (cf. Nöldeke in *ZDMG.* xxxvi. 669 sqq.); Duval, *Les dialectes neo-araméens de Salamas*, Paris, 1883; Merx, *Neusyrisches Leseb.* 4to, Breslau, 1873; Guidi in *ZDMG.* xxxvii. 293 sqq.]

Ev. i. 10 (*Fr. Hist. Gr.* iii. 569)] that it was the name of a god or of a heroic ancestor. In the Old Testament it appears as a geographical term, under the form כְּנַעַן [which is taken to mean "lowland"]. Whether this territorial sense was the original one, may be doubted. Palestine, as a whole, is anything but a low, flat country; and the supposed contrast with אֲרָם is out of the question. It may be that the name was brought by these tribes, as a national designation, from their original home in lower Mesopotamia; or it may be that, as a national designation, it has some other source as yet unknown to us.

Of the different Canaanite races the only one that attained and maintained a great political importance was the *Phoenician*. From the district of Sidon and Tyre the Phoenicians gradually spread, principally northwards, along the coast of Syria, occupying such places as Bērȳtos (Beirūt), Byblos (גִּבְלִי [Gibal, Ezek. xxvii. 9], جَبَل), Botrys (بَثْرُون, Batrūn), Tripolis, Simyra (Σίμυρα, הַצִּמְרִי ["the Zemarite," Gen. x. 18]), Arke ("Ἀρκη or τὰ Ἀρκα, הָעֲרֵקִי ["the Arkite," Gen. x. 17]), Sinnas (Σιννᾶς, הַסִּינִי ["the Sinite," Gen. x. 17]), Aradus (הָאַרְדִּי ["the Arvadite," Gen. x. 18], رَوَاد) and Antaradus (انطرطوس, Tortosa), Laodicea, and Amathe (הַמַּת [Hamath], حَمَاة), farther inland. With the extension of their domains by colonisation we are not now concerned. Suffice it to say that the Phoenicians occupied, in whole or in part, many of the islands of the Mediterranean, such as Cyprus, Rhodes, Crete, Malta, Sicily, the Lipari isles, Sardinia, and the Balearic group. They had settlements in Egypt and throughout all northern Africa, where Carthage rose to be the dreaded rival of Rome. They set foot in Gaul at Massilia or Marseilles¹; and a large portion of Southern Spain was in their hands. From the port of Cadiz their ships sailed

¹ [The evidence for the existence of a Phoenician colony at Marseilles before the Phocaean settlement is wholly archaeological and has broken down bit by bit. Last of all it has been shewn, since these lectures were written, that the famous Phoenician sacrificial tablet is of Carthaginian stone and must have been brought from Carthage; how or when can only be matter of conjecture. See *Corpus Inscr. Sem.* i. 217 sqq.]

southwards along the coast of Africa and northwards towards Britain; whilst from Elath (أَيْلَة) and Ezion-geber on the Red Sea they traded with S. Arabia and India, which they also reached by way of the Persian Gulf. In short, go where you will throughout the ancient world, you find the Phœnician סְחָר, as keen and energetic a trader as his kinsman the modern Jew.

All the languages of this Canaanitic group, it would seem, closely resembled what we call Hebrew; but the only one of them with which we are well acquainted is the Phœnician. It has been preserved to us in numerous inscriptions from all parts of the ancient world, varying in date from the seventh (or eighth) cent. to the first cent. B.C., or, if we include the Punic, to the second or third cent. of our era. The grammar which you should consult is that of Schröder [*Die Phönizische Sprache*, Halle, 1869], and you should also read Stade's treatise "Erneute Prüfung des zwischen dem Phöniciſchen u. Hebräiſchen bestehenden Verwandtschaftsgrades," in *Morgenländische Forschungen*, Leipzig 1875¹.

Of the so-called Hittite empire, the chief seats of which were at Kadesh on the Orontes and subsequently at Karkēmish on the Euphrates, I here say nothing; because it is doubtful whether the *Kheta* of the Egyptians and the *Khatti* of the Assyrians can really be identified with the חֲתִים or בני חת of the Book of Genesis. Ramses II., in the fifteenth cent. B.C., waged war with the Kheta and captured their city Kadesh; and the Khatti were always a bar in the way of the Assyrian kings down to the year 717 B.C., when Sargon succeeded in taking Karkēmish. This northern kingdom may be meant in such passages as 1 Kings x. 29, 2 Kings vii. 6, and 2 Sam. xxiv. 6; but scarcely in Gen. x. 15, xv. 20, and xxiii., or Deut. vii. 1, where we have clearly to deal with a strictly Canaanitic tribe.

(2) The Canaanites were already long masters of the land, when a body of strangers appeared among them. These immigrants had originally started from Ur Kasdim, i.e. the city called in the Assyrian inscriptions *Uru* (now al-Muḡair, المقيّر)

¹ [A complete collection of Phœnician inscriptions will form the first part of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* undertaken by the French *Acad. des Inscr.* The first vol. has appeared, fol. Paris, 1881-87, with atlas of plates.]

in Babylonia, and had gone northwards to Harrān in Mesopotamia. Here a split took place among them. The family of Naḥor remained in Mesopotamia; that of Terah, under the leadership of Abrām, marched south-westwards into Canaan. These strangers received the name of עִבְרִים or עִבְרִיִּים, most probably because they came מֵעֵבֶר הַנָּהָר, from across the great river Euphrates. This is what the LXX. intended when they rendered the words לְאַבְרָם הָעִבְרִי (Gen. xiv. 13) by Ἀβράμ τῷ περάτῃ; and what Origen meant when he explained Ἑβραῖοι by περατικοί. Some of these strangers remained in the country, and in the end permanently occupied different portions of it on the East side of the Jordan and to the east and south of the Dead Sea; viz. the Children of Ammon, of Moab, and of Edom. Others of them, the Children of Ishmael, wandered away among the adjacent Arab tribes to the E. and S.E., and ultimately became inseparable and indistinguishable from them. Others still, the Children of Jacob, after dwelling for some considerable time in Palestine itself, moved southwards, and swelled the ranks of the Semitic immigrants into Egypt. After a sojourn in that country, which is variously estimated at from 215 to 430 years¹, the Children of Jacob fled or were expelled, and resumed a nomade life in the Sinaitic peninsula under the leadership of Moses. This event may be placed in the fifteenth or fourteenth cent. B.C., for the calculations of different scholars vary. Marching northwards they came once more to the borders of Palestine, and passing by their kinsmen of Edom and Moab, they fell upon the Amorites, who had succeeded in crushing Ammon and seriously crippling Moab. The Amorites went down before the fierce assault of Israel, for whom God fought (as the name betokens), and the land to the north of the Arnon was the reward of their prowess. From this vantage-ground they entered upon a long struggle with the Canaanites, which, after various vicissitudes, ended in the substantial triumph of the Israelites and the conquest of large portions of the Canaanite territory, in which they settled side by side with the conquered race.

¹ [See the commentaries on Exod. xii. 40.]

The language of the Hebrews is well known to us, its literature extending over a period of many ages, from the date of the earliest Biblical books down to the redaction of the Mishnah, about the end of the second century after Christ, when Hebrew had long ceased to be the language of ordinary life, and was only written and spoken in the schools. But the same cannot be said of the languages of Ammon, Moab and Edom, of which, till within the last few years, we knew no more than the Old Testament itself could teach us. However, in 1868, the German missionary Klein discovered a stone with a long inscription at Dībān (the ancient Dibon, דִּיבּוֹן) in the territory of Moab. This passed, after it had been broken and mutilated, into the hands of M. Clermont-Ganneau, then one of the officials of the French Consulate at Jerusalem, and is now deposited in the Louvre. This inscription belongs to the time of Mēsha', king of Moab, in the first quarter of the ninth century B.C., and gives an account of his wars with the Israelites and his domestic undertakings. The language is so similar to the Hebrew of the Old Testament that Prof. Roediger simply treated it as such in the last edition which he published of Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar (the twenty-first, 1872)¹.

If, then, the difference between the Phœnicians on the one side, and the Hebrew and Moabite on the other, be so slight, how is this to be explained? In one or other of two ways. We might suppose, firstly, that the ancestors of the Hebrews, who wandered from Ur Kasdim northwards in company with Arameans, were, though of the same stock, yet of a different family from these; and this circumstance might have led to their separation from the Arameans, and to their seeking a home among more closely allied peoples in Canaan. Against this view, however, it may be fairly urged that, in the Old Testament itself (Deut. xxvi. 5), Abram is spoken of as אֲרָמִי אֵינִי "a wandering," or "nomade, Aramean"; and that Jacob's relatives in Paddan Aram are always expressly called Arameans (Gen. xxv. 20, xxviii. 5, xxxi. 20, 24). I incline, therefore, to the second explanation, put forward by Schröder and other scholars, which is this: that

¹ [The latest edition of the "Moabite Stone" is that of Smend and Socin, Freiburg, 1886. In the same year a facsimile of a portion of the inscription with transliteration and translation was published by the Palaeographical Society (2nd Ser. pl. 43).]

these nomade Arameans, the tribes of Abram and Lot, having settled among a Canaanite population of a much higher order of civilisation, were soon constrained to disuse their mother tongue, the Aramaic, and to adopt the kindred language of the people among whom they had settled. To the advanced civilisation of the Hittites and Phoenicians the monuments of Egypt and the Old Testament itself bear ample testimony. We know for certain, thanks to the labours of such Egyptologists as the Vicomte de Rougé and Mr Goodwin, that in the time of Ramses II., that is, in the fifteenth century B.C., the Kheta of Kadesh were in possession of the art of writing and of a literature. And as for the Phoenicians, when Solomon desired to build his Temple to Jehovah, Hiram king of Tyre supplied the materials and the artisans; when Solomon sought to trade with South Arabia, it was again Hiram who manned the fleet of ships at Ezion-geber. That a small and less civilised tribe, such as the Hebrews in the time of Abram undoubtedly were, should have soon adopted the language of the more numerous and cultivated race among whom they took up their abode, has in itself nothing surprising, and is a fact not altogether unknown in history. In France and Spain, for example, the conquering German race soon gave up the use of its mother-tongue, which left but slight traces of the conquest upon the language of the conquered. The Norsemen invaded and took possession of a district in France, to which they gave their name; but the Normans invaded England as a French-speaking people, and were again in process of time merged among the English whom they conquered.

The last great section of the Semitic languages is the *Southern*, or Arabian, which we may divide into three branches; viz. the North Arabian or Arabic, commonly so called; the South Arabian or Himyaritic; and the Ge'ez or Ethiopic.

1. *Arabic* is, in its historical career and literary development, one of the latest of the Semitic languages to rise into prominent notice. Though we read of wars between the Arabs and the Assyrians, the Romans, and the Persians, who were each acknowledged at different periods as liege lords of a considerable part of the Arabian Peninsula; yet it was not till the

seventh century of our era that the nation acquired a really historical importance. It was under Muḥammad and his successors that the Arabs, maddened by religious enthusiasm, rushed forth from their deserts like a torrent; broke the Byzantine power on the banks of the Hieromax (Yarmūk); crushed the might of Persia on the day of al-Ḳādisiyah; and adding conquest to conquest, planted the standard of their Prophet, within a hundred years, upon the banks of the Indus in the east and of the Tagus in the west.

The literary development of the race dates from the same period. Before Muḥammad's time the northern Arabs had only a literature of ballads, mostly handed down by oral tradition. With the promulgation of the Ḳor'ān a new era commenced, and there are few, if any, nations of ancient and medieval Europe which can boast of a literature like the Arabic, especially in history, geography, philosophy, and other sciences, to say nothing of poetry, and of the peculiar systems of theology and law which depend upon the Ḳor'ān and the Sunnah.

The Arabic language was thus peculiarly fortunate. Leading a life of comparative seclusion—not ground, like the Arameans and Canaanites, between the two grindstones of Assyria, Babylon, or Persia, on the one side, and Egypt on the other; nor, like the Phoenicians, thrown by commerce and colonisation into close contact with a dozen foreign nations—the Arabs had preserved, down to the sixth or seventh century of our era, far more of the ancient form and fashion of Semitic speech than any of their congeners. If not the Sanskrit, Arabic is at least the Lithuanian among the Semitic tongues. At this particular period too the dialect of the tribe of Ḳoraish¹, which had already acquired a certain supremacy over the rest, was fixed by the Ḳor'ān as the future literary language of the whole nation. Had it not been for this circumstance, we might have known Arabic in the form of half a dozen languages, differing from one another almost as widely as the members of the Romance group or the modern languages of northern India. But its literature has in a great measure prevented this, and preserved the unity of the language, so that the dialectic divergences

¹ [The Ḳoraish, i.e. the branch of Kināna settled in and about Mecca, were the tribe of the prophet.]

of what is called "vulgar Arabic" are by no means so great as we might have expected after all the struggles and vicissitudes of the last twelve centuries. From the mouth of the Tigris, throughout Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine, Arabia proper, Egypt, and North Africa, as far as Morocco, the language is essentially one and the same—Arabic, sunk by the gradual decay of its inflection to the level at which we become acquainted with Aramaic and Hebrew. In its purest form it is probably to be heard among the Bedawīn; in its most corrupt in the island of Malta. The standard grammar of the classical Arabic is that of Silvestre de Sacy (second edition, 2 vols. Paris, 1831¹). Smaller works in various languages are numerous. For the modern dialects there is also an ample choice. For the Egyptian dialect none can compete with Spitta, *Grammatik des Arabischen Vulgardiialectes von Egypten* (1880). For the Syrian a useful book is the *Grammaire Arabe vulgaire* of Caussin de Perceval (fourth edition, 1858); and for the Algerian the *Éléments de la Langue Algérienne* of A. P. Pihan (1851). The Maltese has been treated by Vassalli, *Grammatica della lingua Maltese*, second edition, 1827; and by Gesenius in his *Versuch über die Maltesische Sprache* (Leipzig 1810).

2. The *South Arabian* or *Himyaritic* [also called Sabæan] is one of the less known of the Semitic tongues. I use the term Himyaritic (حِمْيَرِيَّة, Ὠμῆριται) here, in its widest sense, to denote the language, or rather group of languages, whose territory extends along the south coast of Arabia, from the strait of Bāb-el-Mandeb on the west to the mouth of the Persian Gulf on the east. There seems to be little doubt that the three great provinces of al-Yemen, Ḥadramaut (Ḥazramūt, Gen. x. 26), and Mahrah, spoke dialects of one tongue, and that these dialects have their modern representatives in the Eḥkilī, also called Ḥakilī or Ḳarāwī, and the Mehri.

The ancient Himyaritic is chiefly known to us through inscriptions, which have been found in great numbers, especially

¹ [The grammar of De Sacy is now difficult to procure, and the reader who desires to bring his knowledge down to date must take with it the notes of Fleischer, which form the first volume of his *Kleinere Schriften*, Leipzig, 1885. Students will therefore prefer the excellent grammar of the author of these lectures, 2nd ed. London, 1874.]

in the most accessible of the three provinces above named, that of al-Yemen. How far back they may go in point of time is uncertain. According to Mordtmann and D. H. Müller in their *Sabäische Denkmäler* (4th Vienna, 1883), p. 86, the era of the three dated inscriptions as yet known to us is, as guessed by Reinaud, the Seleucian. These inscriptions belong therefore to A.D. 261, 328, and 357¹. None of the Ḥimyaritic monuments are likely to be later than the seventh century of our era. The grammar of these languages has not yet been formally compiled by any one orientalist, but we may soon expect a work on the subject from the competent hand of Prof. D. H. Müller of Vienna.

3. Crossing over into Africa, we encounter the Ge'ez or Ethiopic, the language of the Abyssinians, an ancient Ḥimyaritic colony, as the word ግዕዝ: "migration" or "the emigrants," itself shews. Its territory is the mountainous region S.W. of Nubia, where its modern representatives still flourish. The most prominent of these are: on the north, the *Tigré*, spoken in the Dahlak islands, and on the mainland in Ṣamhar and by the Habab, Mensa, Bogos, and neighbouring tribes; in the centre, the *Tigrīna* [or *Tigrāi*], which prevails in the districts of Dembeyā, Hama-sēn, Sarawē, Akala-guzai, and Agamē, around the ancient capital of Aksūm, and in the region of Walkait; and in the south, the *Amhariṇa* or *Amharic*, the language of Samēn and the districts around Gondar and the Lake Ṣānā or Ṭānā, as far as Gōjām. Of these three languages, the Tigré most resembles the old Ge'ez, whilst the Amharic has deviated furthest from it.

The oldest monuments of the Ethiopic literature are a few inscriptions, belonging to the first five or six centuries of our era. Next to these we must rank the translation of the Bible, executed probably at different times, during a space of several centuries from the fourth century onwards. The bulk of the literature is, however, modern, and consists of translations from the Coptic, and still more frequently from the Arabic, which were produced

¹ [In his article "Yemen" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th ed. vol. xxiv. (1888), Prof. Müller looks with some favour on the view put forward by Halévy (*Ét. Sab.* p. 86), who takes the inscription Ḥiṣn Ghorāb, dated 640, to speak of the overthrow of Dhū Nuwās, and so fixes on 115 B.C. as the epoch of the Sabæan era. In that case the *five* dated inscriptions now known are to be ascribed to A.D. 270, 458, 467, 525, and 554 respectively. Cf. *C.I.S.*, IV. i. p. 18.]

in abundance from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries, when the ancient Ge'ez had died out, but was still cultivated by the priesthood, like Latin by the learned of Europe or Hebrew in the Talmudic schools. The standard grammar of the ancient Ge'ez is that of Dillmann [Leipzig, 1857] which has superseded that of Ludolfus or Leuthof, an admirable work in its day. The Tigrīna dialect has been handled by Praetorius, *Grammatik der Tigrīna-Sprache* (Halle, 1871) [and Schreiber, *Man. de la langue Tigrāi* (Vien. 1887)]. For the Amharic I may name the works of Isenberg (1842) and Massaja, *Lectiones grammaticales* (Paris, 1867); but the best book on the subject is that of Praetorius, *Die Amharische Sprache* (1879). [See also Guidi, *Gr. elem. della l. Amariña* (Rome, 1889)].

Having thus taken a rapid and necessarily imperfect survey of the Semitic languages, it may be well for us to spend a few minutes on an inquiry as to their connexion, real or imaginary, with the great contiguous families, more especially with the Indo-European and the Egyptian.

This is a question of great difficulty, and not to be settled in the crude and offhand manner of Fürst and Delitzsch on the one hand or of von Raumer and Raabe on the other. The temptation to identification is great, and too much weight has been attributed by the scholars mentioned, and even by men of higher reputation, to analogies that lie merely on the surface. The Semitic languages, like the Indo-European, belong to the inflective class; but this circumstance, as Whitney has remarked (*Language and the Study of Language*, 3rd ed., p. 300), by no means implies a genetic connexion or even descent from a common stock. The resemblance between the two families is, on the whole, not greater than we might reasonably expect to find in languages produced by human beings of nearly the same natural endowments under very similar circumstances of development. The probability of an ultimate connexion will of course seem greatest to those who believe in a common birthplace of the two races. If they both spread themselves abroad from a point near the Caspian Sea, or in Central Asia, original unity is not impossible. But if the Indo-Europeans rooted in Central

Asia, or, as some recent scholars (such as Penka in his *Origines Ariacae* [Teschen, 1883], and O. Schrader, in his *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte* [Jena, 1883]) have tried to prove, on the shores of the Baltic, whilst the Semites were autochthones in Central Arabia, the chances of original unity are reduced to a vanishing point. An ultimate relationship, if one exist at all, will only be discovered when we have solved the great mystery of the Semitic tongues, the triliterality of the roots. With a few exceptions, the most important of which are the pronouns, every Semitic root, as historically known to us, is triliteral; it consists of three letters, neither more nor less, and these three are consonants. The vowels play only a secondary rôle. The consonants give the meaning of the word; the vowels express its modifications. The letters *kṭl* (كـ تـ لـ, قـ تـ لـ), for example, are the bones of a skeleton, which the vowels clothe with flesh and endow with life. These three consonants convey the idea of "kill." Add vowels, and you get such words as *qatal* قَتَلَ "he killed," *kutila* كُتِلَ "he was killed"; *katl* كَتَلَ "the act of killing" or "of being killed"; *kṭl* كَتَلَ "a killer," "an enemy"; *kātil* قَاتِلَ "killing." The use of prefixes, affixes, and even of infixes, is common to both families of languages; but the Indo-Europeans have nothing like this triconsonantal rule with its varying vocalisation as a means of grammatical inflexion. The Indo-European roots are not thus restricted in their nature; the radical vowels, although more liable to phonetic change than the consonants, are as essential a part of the root as these latter. A root may consist of a single vowel; of a vowel followed by one or more consonants; of one or more consonants followed by a vowel; of a vowel preceded and followed by a single consonant; and so on. The Sanskrit roots *i* "go," *sthā* "stand," *ad* "eat," *vid* "know," *grabh* "seize," are something wholly different in character from the Semitic roots *kṛb* "come near," *kṭl* "kill," *plg* "divide," which, as Bopp has justly remarked (*Vergl. Gr.*, 2^{te} Ausg., 1^{ter} Bd, p. 196), are unpronounceable, because, in giving them vowels, we make an advance to a special grammatical form. And yet here, if any-

where, will an ultimate connexion between these two families of languages be discovered. It cannot escape the observation of the student that a great many Semitic roots have two consonants in common, whilst the third seems less essential, and is therefore variable. For example, *kt* or *kd* are common to the series, قَطَم, قَطَل, قَطَف, قَطَعَ, قَطَّ, قَذَّ, قَدَح, قَدَّ, قَتَلَ, قَتَّ, all of which convey the idea of "cutting" in some form or other.

Pl or *fl* are found in فَلَاح, فَلَج, فَلَح, فَلَح, فَلَذ, فَلَع, فَلَق, all meaning "cleave" or "divide." *H, k* are the basis of حَقَق, حَقَر, حَقَا, حَقَكَ, of which the original signification is also "slit" or "cut." *Ph* or *fh* are the essential constituents of نَفَخ, نَفَح, نَفَّح, نَفَح, meaning "blow," "puff." When Semitic philology has advanced so far as to have discovered the laws by which the original biliterals (assuming their separate existence) were converted into trilaterals; when we are able to account for the position and to explain the function of each variable constituent of the trilateral roots; then, and not till then, may we venture to think of comparing the primitive Indo-European and Semitic vocabularies. Meantime, to assert the identity of such a word as בָּנָה "he built" with *pono*, or of בָּעַר "he burned up" with *πῶρ*, is little better than sheer folly. And why? Because the comparison is not that of original forms, but of an original form (or what is very nearly so) with a comparatively late development. בָּנָה was originally *bānāyā*; *pōno* is a softening of *posno*, as we learn from its perfect and supine, and includes a suffix and a pronominal element. בָּעַר originally sounded *ba'ara*; *πῶρ* is stated to be a contraction of *πῶῖρ*, which probably stands for an original **pavar*, and comes from a radical *pu*, in Sanskrit "to be bright," "to purify," *plus* a derivative suffix. If such comparisons as these could be upheld, they would prove that Hebrew and Arabic were not merely connected with, but actually derived from Sanskrit or Greek or Latin. What has been written on this subject by Fürst and by the elder Delitzsch in his *Jesurun* (1838) is absolutely worthless; as are also the lucubrations of von Raumer and Raabe. The best that can be

said about it you will find in the younger Delitzsch's *Studien über Indogermanisch-Semitische Wurzelverwandtschaft* (Leipzig 1873) and in McCurdy's *Aryo-Semitic Speech* (1881).

As to the affinity of the Egyptian language with the Semitic stock, that is also a question which is as yet *sub judice*. Benfey, in his well-known work *Ueber das Verhältniss der ägyptischen Sprache zum semitischen Sprachstamm* (Leipzig 1844), sought to establish this affinity by various considerations, grammatical and lexicographical; and the conclusion to which he came was, that the Semites are only one branch of a great family, which includes not only the Egyptians but also all the other languages of Africa. His views have been combated by Pott, Renan, and other scholars; and certainly in this unrestricted form they seem to land us in almost Turanian absurdities. But with regard to the ancient Egyptian and the Coptic, Egyptologists seem gradually to be arriving at conclusions similar to those of Benfey. De Rougé, Ebers, and above all Brugsch, in the introduction to his *Hieroglyphic Dictionary*, have declared their belief in the descent of the Egyptian from the same stock as the Semitic languages. An examination of the Coptic alone readily suggests several considerations in support of this view. For example, there is the marvellous similarity, almost amounting to identity, of the personal pronouns, both separate and suffixed—a class of words which languages of radically different families are not apt to borrow from one another. “I” in Coptic is ἄποκ, ἄπακ.

“Thou” ἡτοκ, ἡτακ

“He” ἡθοϥ, etc.

“She” ἡθοο, etc.

“We” ἄποπ, ἄπαп

“Ye” ἡϩωτεп, ἡτωῖп, ἡтаῖп

“They” ἡϩωот, ἡтоот, ἡтаτ

The suffix pronouns I give as they appear in connexion with the preposition па “to.”

“to me” ппп, пап

“to us” пап

“to thee,” m. паκ

“to you” пϩωтеп, пптеп

f. пс

“to him” паϥ

“to them” пϩωот, паτ

“to her” пас

Again, there is the curious resemblance in the forms of some of the simplest numerals; e.g.

1, masc. *отѧ*, *отѧ*, *отѧт*; fem. *отѧ*, *отѧ*, *отѧт*

2, masc. *спѧт*, fem. *септе*, *спотѧ*

7, masc. *шѧшѧ*, *сѧшѧ*; fem. *шѧшѧ*, *сѧшѧ*

8, masc. *шмнп*, *шмотп*; fem. *шмнп*, *шмотпѧ*.

In the verb, the formation of the present tense presents a remarkable analogy to that of the Semitic imperfect or, as some still prefer to call it, future,—I mean the form *לִּיכְתֹּב*. E.g.

sing. 1. *†. тѧм* *I am joining, adhering*; pl. 1. *тѧп. тѧм*

2. m. *в. тѧм*, *х. тѧм* 2. *тѧтѧп. тѧм*

f. *тѧ. тѧм*

3. m. *ѧ. тѧм* 3. *сѧ. тѧм*


f. *с. тѧм*

Analogies like these seem to favour the idea of a genetic relationship between the Semitic languages and the Egyptian; or at least of a closer affinity than can be said to subsist between the Semitic and the Indo-European. To discover any connexion between the two latter, we must endeavour to work our way back to the very earliest stage of their history—to a period before Semitic really was Semitic; we must try to disintegrate the triliteral Semitic root; to extract from it the biliteral, which alone can be compared with the Indo-European radical. And if haply we succeed in this, it is apparently the utmost that we can hope for; their subsequent developments, the growth of their grammatical systems, are wholly distinct and discordant. But the connexion between the Semitic and the Egyptian languages seems to be of a somewhat nearer kind. It is true that we are met by the old difficulty with regard to the form of the Egyptian roots, the majority of which are monosyllabic, and certainly do not exhibit Semitic triliterality; but, on the other hand, we have not a few structural affinities, which may perhaps be thought sufficient to justify those linguists who hold that Egyptian is a relic of the earliest age of Semitism, of Semitic speech as it was before it passed into the peculiar form in which we may be said to know it historically.

CHAPTER III.

SEMITIC WRITING.

AFTER these preliminary investigations and surveys, there remains yet another subject on which it is desirable to say a few words before we address ourselves to the special object of these lectures, the comparative grammar of the Semitic languages. That subject is—the origin and history of Semitic writing. My account of this interesting topic must, however, be very brief and sketchy; the more so as I hope to treat it more fully in a subsequent course of lectures. Meantime I would refer those of you who seek further details to the treatise of the Vicomte de Rougé, *Mémoire sur l'origine égyptienne de l'alphabet phénicien*, 1874; to the work of Lenormant, *Essai sur la propagation de l'alphabet phénicien dans l'ancien monde*, of which the first part appeared in 1872, and two more have since been added, though the book must now unhappily remain unfinished; to the *Mélanges d'Archéologie orientale* of the Cte de Vogüé, 1868; and to Mr Isaac Taylor's excellent book *The Alphabet* [London, 1883], especially vol. i.







All writing—Chinese, Assyrian, Egyptian—was originally pictorial. The next stage was that of the ideogram. Each picture received a fixed, often symbolic, value, and was always used in the same way. In Egyptian the figure of a tongue meant “to speak”; two hands holding a shield and spear meant “to fight”; and so on. The third step—a great one—was to make a particular sign stand in all cases for one and the same syllabic sound; e.g., the figure of a mouth  for *ro*, the Egyptian for “mouth”; the figure of a hand for *tot*; the figure of an eye for *iri*. The last and greatest step was to divide the syllable into its component parts or letters, and to represent

each of these by a special figure. Here the ancient Egyptians happily lighted upon what has been called the "acrophonic" principle; that is to say, they designated each letter by the picture of an object, the name of which began with the sound which the letter was to represent. For example, the picture of a *lion*, would mean the letter *l*, because the word *labo*, $\lambda\alpha\beta\omicron\iota$, begins with that sound; the picture of an *owl* the letter *m*, because the word *mūlag*, $\mu\omicron\upsilon\lambda\alpha\gamma$, begins with that sound; the picture of a *mouth* the letter *r*, because the word *ro*, $\rho\omicron$, begins with *r*.

To this stage the Egyptians attained at a very early period; but, like the inventors of the cuneiform characters, they did not avail themselves fully of their great discovery. On the contrary, they mixed up the two principles, the ideographic and the phonetic, in a manner that is extremely puzzling to the reader. To an Egyptian the figure of a *lion* might actually mean "a lion"; or it might, as an ideogram, be a symbolic sign, meaning "preeminence," "sovereignty"; or it might, as a mere letter, designate the sound *l*. To an Assyrian a certain combination of wedges might convey the idea of "the earth"; but phonetically it might express the syllable *kī*. Hence the mass of determinative signs of various kinds employed in writing by the Egyptians, Assyrians and Chinese.


Of course, in process of time, the picture gradually faded away. Details were neglected; a few bold strokes sufficed to depict the object intended; and, in the end, the form of the *letter* often bore little or no resemblance to the *thing* from which it was derived. The group of wedges, the hieratic or demotic character, and the modern Chinese sign, are, in most cases, wholly unlike any object in heaven or earth.

The Egyptians, in addition to the stiff pictorial hieroglyphs, had two sorts of more current or cursive characters, called the hieratic and the demotic. The former, used (as the name indicates) by the priests, was employed for sacred writings only; the latter, used by the people, served for all ordinary secular purposes. It was of the former that the inventors or adapters of the Semitic alphabet appear to have availed themselves. They used the forms which are found in papyri anterior to the eighteenth dynasty, belonging, roughly speaking, to the period between 2100 and 1500 B.C. De Rougé endeavours to show

that out of the twenty-two Phœnician letters, fifteen are beyond doubt directly derived from Egyptian models, whilst only one, the *ayin*, is clearly of Semitic invention. It may be that the "spoiling of the Egyptians" went so far; that the plundering Semites appropriated not only the idea of a written alphabet, but the very forms which the letters were to take. However, I cannot profess myself entirely convinced, not even by Mr Isaac Taylor's argumentation. If they did so, the Semites both remodelled and renamed their acquisitions. Out of the Egyptian *eagle* or *culture*  they made the head and horns of an ox, ; the *throw*, , became the head and neck of a *camel*, ; the group of lotus plants growing out of the water, , a *set of teeth*, ; and so on¹.

Deecke's attempt to derive the forms of the Semitic alphabet from the Assyrian, I must regard as an utter failure. You will find his views stated in an article in the *ZDMG.*, vol. xxxi. p. 102.

The remodelled Egyptian alphabet has been, in the hands of the Phœnicians and other Semites, the parent of nearly all the systems of writing used by the nations of Europe and Western Asia. The Greeks received it from the Phœnicians, and having again remodelled it, passed it on to the Etruscans, the Romans, and the Copts. The sacred books of the Persians are written with an alphabet of Aramaic origin. The Uigür Tatars [and through them the Mongols] acknowledge a similar obligation. And even the Sanskrit alphabet, with all its Asiatic offshoots, has been traced to a South Semitic source.

The oldest monument of Semitic writing as yet discovered, with what we may call a certain date, is the inscription of Mēsha', , king of Moab, which we may place about B.C. 890². Here we find already a carefully developed system of orthography and punctuation, which contrasts favourably with those of Phœnician inscriptions of later date by several centuries. Final vowels are expressed by the letters ' (*i*), ׀ (*ū*) and ׀ (*ō*),

¹ Halévy, with whom Nöldeke inclines to agree, derives the Semitic alphabet from the hieroglyphs.

² [i.e. soon after the death of Ahab, which, according to the received chronology, took place 897 B.C. If, as is concluded from the Assyrian monuments, Ahab was alive in 854 and took part in the battle of Karkar (Schrader, *Keilinschr. und AT.* 2nd ed. Giessen, 1883, pp. 199, 463) the stone of Mesha dates from about 850 B.C.]

e.g. *לֵה, בְּבִיתָהּ, עָשׂוּ, בְּנֵתִי, אָבִי*; and the words are separated by a single point, which is also found in a few of the younger Phœnician inscriptions, and in Samaritan, and which we may compare with the line | of the Hîmyaritic, and the two dots of the Ethiopic (:)¹. Equally old, if not older, is the inscription on the fragments of a bronze bowl discovered in Cyprus (*Corpus Inscr. Semitt.*; i. pp. 22-26, and pl. iv). To the same class of alphabets as these inscriptions belong the various Phœnician monuments and coins of Tyre and Sidon, Gēbal, Cyprus, Athens, Malta, Sicily, Sardinia, Marseilles, Carthage and other parts of N. Africa, and Spain. The oldest of these date from the sixth or fifth century B.C., whilst of the youngest or Neopunic many are post-Christian. The difference between the earlier and later monuments in the form of certain letters is very marked. Observe these in particular:—

	Moab	Cyprus	Sidon
ג	𐤂		𐤁
ד	𐤃	𐤃	𐤃
ז	𐤅	𐤅	𐤅
ה	𐤄	𐤄	𐤄
ט	𐤆	𐤆	𐤆
י	𐤇	𐤇	𐤇
כ	𐤈	𐤈	𐤈
ל	𐤊	𐤊	𐤊
מ	𐤍	𐤍	𐤍
ס	𐤎	𐤎	𐤎
ק	𐤏	𐤏	𐤏
ש	𐤑	𐤑	𐤑
ת	𐤒	𐤒	𐤒

The ancient Hebrew modification of the Semitic alphabet is now known to us in a document to which an approximate date can be assigned, viz. the Siloam inscription, of the seventh

¹ [Cf. the facsimile, *Palaeographical Society*, 2nd Series, pl. xliii. (1886).]

century B.C.¹ As compared with the Mēsha' alphabet, notable varieties in the forms of single letters are:—

	Moab	Israel		Moab	Israel
א	𐤀	𐤁	מ	𐤌	𐤍
ב	𐤂	𐤃	ע	𐤅	𐤆
ג	𐤄	𐤅	צ	𐤇	𐤈
ד	𐤆	𐤇	ק	𐤈	𐤉

Old seals and other gems, dating, say, from the seventh to the fourth century B.C., exhibit identical forms; and the same remark applies to two fragmentary inscriptions from the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, discovered by M. Clermont-Ganneau and now deposited in the British Museum. This alphabet is still found, with slight modifications, upon the Maccabee and other Jewish coins; and is known to us in its latest shape as the *Samaritan* alphabet. It began, however, to be disused by the Jews even before the commencement of our era, and to be supplanted by a modified form of the Palmyrene character, the so-called *square* character, כְּתָב מִרְבָּע. Some of the extant inscriptions of this type belong to the century preceding our era. For the first three or four centuries after Christ our materials, though not abundant, are sufficiently ample for palaeographical purposes.

The third of the Semitic alphabets is the Aramaic, our knowledge of which commences with some Assyrian weights, which go back as far as the seventh or eighth century before our era. There are also extant some gems and seals of nearly the same age. Among the inscriptions may be mentioned that recently discovered by Prof. Euting at Taimā, clearly belonging to the Persian period, say from the sixth to the fourth century B.C. A sure mark of antiquity in this, as well as in the Phœnician alphabet, is the undulating or wavy form of the letters *m* and *s/h*, as contrasted with the later forms, which exhibit a cross-line. In the inscription of Mēsha', as well as in the Assyrian weights, we find 𐤌 𐤍 and 𐤏, which become at a later time 𐤌 𐤍 and 𐤏. The letter 𐤐 too in the Moabite

¹ [Cf. the facsimile in the *Oriental Series* of the Palaeographical Society, Plate lxxxvii. (1882). "The inscription...may be ascribed to the reign of Hezekiah towards the year 700 B.C.": cf. 2 Kings xx. 20; 2 Chron. xxxii. 30.]

stele and the oldest Aramean seals has the forms 𐤀 𐤁, whereas later on it appears as 𐤁 𐤂 𐤃 𐤄 and the like. A peculiarity of the Aramean alphabet is that some of the letters have open heads, and thus contrast markedly with the closed heads of the Phoenician type. These are:—

	Phoen.	Aram.
𐤁	𐤀	𐤁
𐤂	𐤃 𐤄	𐤅 𐤆
𐤇	𐤈	𐤉
𐤊	𐤋	𐤌

To this class belong the Egyptian-Aramaic alphabet, the Nabathean (including the Sinaitic inscriptions), and the Syriac Estrangēlā with all its more modern developments, comprising the Mandaic on the one hand and the Kūfic and Naskhī Arabic on the other. The character of the Palmyrene inscriptions is very interesting, as coming nearest to the Jewish square character.

The alphabet used by the southern Semites, though ultimately sprung from the same stock as the Phoenician and Aramean alphabets, must have been separated from them at a very remote time, and have run its course under peculiar influences. The oldest inscriptions which we possess, whether from North or South Arabia, whether Thamūdite (aṣ-Ṣafā)¹ or Himyaritic or Ethiopic, are written, like all other Semitic writings, from right to left. Others, probably of later date, are written, to use a Greek word, *βουστροφηδόν*, "as the ox turns in ploughing," that is, like some Greek inscriptions, alternately from right to left and left to right. Finally the latter course

¹ [The inscriptions of aṣ-Ṣafā in the volcanic region S.E. of Damascus were first observed by Graham in 1857. Ten were published by Wetzstein (*Reisebericht*, Berl. 1860) more by De Vogüé in his *Syrie Centrale, Inscr. Sémit.* (4^e Paris, 1868-77); cf. Halévy's papers in *J. As.* 1877, 81, 82. Other inscriptions in the same character have been copied by Doughty and Euting in various parts of northern Arabia, especially in the region associated with the name of the ancient race of Thamūd (Θαμουνδηνοί); hence the name Thamuditic. Euting's inscriptions have been deciphered by D. H. Müller (*Denkschr.* of the Vienna Acad. 1889). Twenty-six characters have been determined, and a twenty-seventh probably corresponds to the Arabic ظ "A sign for ض probably existed but does not occur in known inscriptions."]

prevailed, and the Ethiopian, like the Greek, wrote from left to right, even as we do at the present day.

The Semitic alphabet, as framed by the Semites upon an Egyptian model, consisted of twenty-two letters, all consonants, which were faithfully retained by the Arameans. The Hebrews long subsequently added one to this number, by distinguishing וּ into שׁ *sh* and ס *s*. The Arabs, who tried to distinguish the finer shades of sounds in writing, required no less than six additional letters; viz. ظ and ذ and ث, as lisping modifications of ط and د and ت; and غ and خ as harder forms of ع and ح. The order of the Syriac alphabet was retained by them in the numerical values of the letters, אבגד הוז חטי כלמן סעפצ קרשת תכזך צמחא; but the ordinary sequence of the letters was very much altered, chiefly for the sake of bringing similar sounds or similar figures into juxtaposition, e.g. ב, ת, ט, כ, etc. The Ethiopic alphabet has two letters fewer than the Arabic, or twenty-six in all, owing to the addition of ג *x* and ז *z* which it has in common with the Arabic, and of two *ps*, the one of native origin פ *pait*, the other borrowed from the Greek, פ *pa*, perhaps originally *psa*. The sequence of the letters differs both from the Hebrew and Arabic : א ב ג ד ה ו ז ח ט י כ ל מ נ ס ע פ צ ק ר ש ת פ פ ס פ ט פ ז פ ח פ ט פ י פ כ פ ל פ מ פ נ פ ס פ ע פ פ פ ק פ ר פ ש פ ת.

From what I have just said you will see that I do not regard the ancient Semitic alphabets as adequately representing all the sounds of the Semitic languages. My belief is that the finer shades of utterance were disregarded, and that one sign was in several cases used to represent two cognate sounds. I believe that the lisped dentals of the Arabic, ظ ذ ث, and the letter ض (as distinguished from ص), represent sounds of the proto-semitic tongue. I also think that the stronger gutturals خ and غ, as distinguished from ح and ع, belonged to that speech; and that it probably had three sibilants (besides ج *z* and ص *s*), viz. *sh* (ش), *s* (س), and *s'* = ס, of which last sound I do not know the peculiar original nuance. De Lagarde¹ and others think that it was originally *ks* or *ksh*, which was gradually softened into *sh* and then into *s*.

¹ [Lagarde, *Symmicta* (Goettingen, 1877), p. 113 sq.]

CHAPTER IV.

THE LETTERS OF THE SEMITIC ALPHABET AND THE CHANGES THEY UNDERGO.

WE will now proceed to examine the letters of this alphabet in detail, and to ascertain, so far as is possible within our present narrow limits, what changes they undergo in the different Semitic languages, more especially in Arabic, Syriac, and Hebrew; so that we may be enabled to compare the words of these languages with one another, not by haphazard, but according to certain fixed rules. For this purpose it will be best to arrange the letters in groups, according to the vocal organs with which they are pronounced.

I. We commence then with the gutturals, which are in Syriac and Hebrew four in number, א, ה, ח, and ע. In Arabic and Ethiopic ח has two representatives, ح and ح; whilst in Arabic ע has two representatives, ع and غ. Most scholars regard the sounds of ح and غ as a later development in Arabic and Ethiopic; but with this view I am not disposed to agree. I believe, on the contrary, that these differences of sound existed from the earliest times, but that the inventors of the Semitic alphabet were not careful to distinguish in writing what seemed to them to be merely different shades of the same sound. That the Hebrew possessed the sound of غ seems certain from the fact that the LXX. expresses ע by γ (i.e. *g*/*h*) in several proper names; e.g. עֵיזָה, Γάζα, غَزَّة; עֵמֶרָה, Γομόρρα; זָעֵר, Ζόγορα and Σηγώρ, زَغَر. Further, Χοδολλογομόρ = כְּדָרְלָעֶמֶר, corres-

ponding with an Elamitic *Kudur-Lagamar* (a name formed like *Kudur-Mabūg* and *Kudur-nahundi* or *Kudur-nanḥundi*); and Γαῖδάδ for עֵדָד, Genesis iv. 18, where the Massoretic text has (probably incorrectly) עֵדָד. On the contrary, ע is indicated in Greek merely by the *spiritus asper*, and even more frequently the *spiritus lenis*, with a vowel; or in the middle and at the end of a word by a vowel alone; as Ἠλί, 'עֲלִי; Ἐβραῖος, 'עֲבָרִי; Ἀμαλήκ, 'עֲמָלִק; Συμεών, שִׁמְעוֹן; Φαραώ, פֶּרְעֶה; Γελβονέ, גִּלְבָּעַ. It is not so easy to prove the existence of ֶ as distinct from ח in Hebrew, because the Greeks had no precise equivalent for either sound, and expressed them by κ, χ and the soft breathing indifferently. Thus the name of the river חֲבֹר is in one place Χαβώρας, ἈΛΧΑΒΟΡ, and in another Ἀβώρας [Ἀβόρρας, etc.]; حَرَّان, حَرَّان, becomes Χαρράν and Κάρραι; פֶּסַח is transliterated by πάσχα and الفصح. However, the comparison of the cognate languages, particularly Arabic and Assyrian, makes it exceedingly probable that the distinction of ח and ֶ once existed in Hebrew and Aramaic. Compare חֲבַל bind, حَبَل, with חֲבַל act wickedly, خَبَل be corrupted, unsound, mad; חָפַר dig, حَفَرَ, with חָפַר be ashamed, bashful, خَفَرَ; חָלַל profane, desecrate, حَلَّ, حَلَّ, حَلَّ, with חָלַל bore, wound, خَلَّ¹.

I. Of these gutturals א is the weakest, indicating nothing more than that very slight, almost imperceptible, movement of the vocal organs, which the Greeks represent in writing, though only at the beginning of a word, by the *spiritus lenis*. The Arabs have a special sign for it, viz. the hamza, ء, which they

¹ [For the evidence to a similar effect from the Assyrian see p. 50, *infra*; also Delitzsch, *Prolegomena eines neuen hebräisch-aram. Wörterbuchs zum A T.* (Leipz. 1886) p. 173 sq.]

with entire disappearance of the **א**, **מִמְלָא** for **מִמְלָא**.—At the end of a syllable in the middle of a word א is very apt to pass into a vowel-letter, and to be brought into conformity with the preceding vowel. Thus **רָאֵס** *ra'sun* becomes **רָאֵס** *rās*; **דְּלִיבָא** *dli'bun* becomes **דְּלִיב** *dliḥb*; **סוּלָא** *su'lun* becomes **סוּל** *sûl*. The usual spelling **דְּלִיב**, **סוּל**, is a compromise in writing between the ancient and the modern forms (**דְּלִיב** : **סוּל**). Hebrew, Syriac, and Assyrian, took nearly the same course. An original **רָאֵשׁ** first became **רָאֵשׁ** *rāsh* in Hebrew, as in the actual plural **רָאֵשִׁים**, and then **רֹאֵשׁ** *rōsh*. We should have expected this form to be written **רוֹשׁ**, but here the spelling has lagged behind the pronunciation, and the **א** remains as a vestige of the original form. So also **דְּלִיבָא** *dli'bun*, “sheep,” Hebrew originally **צֹאן**, then **צֹאן**, and finally **צֹאן** *ṣōn*. The corresponding Aramaic forms are **רִישׁ**, **רִישׁ**, for **רָאֵשׁ**, and **עֹן**, **עֹן**, for **דְּלִיבָא**. In Assyrian I find cited such forms as *rēshu* or *rīshu*, *ṣēnu* or *ṣīnu*.—Initial **א** is often dropped at the beginning of words, when pronounced with a short vowel; e.g. **נֶחֱנוּ** for **אֶנְשֵׁי**; **אֶחָד**, **אֶחָד**, for **אֶחָד** (Heb. **אֶחָד**); **נִשְׁתָּא** for **אֶנְשֵׁי** (Assyr. *nīshu*); **אֶחָד** = **אֶחָד**; **אֶחָד** = **אֶחָד**; **אֶחָד** = **אֶחָד**, but plur. **אֶחָד**; **אֶחָד** *kinsman*, from **אֶחָד**. Similarly in vulgar Arabic, **أَحَد** for **أَحَد**, **أَكَل** for **أَكَل**, **أَحَد** for **أَحَد**. *Per contra*, an initial **א** with its vowel may be merely prosthetic, to lighten the pronunciation of an unpleasant combination of consonants, especially in foreign words; e.g. **أَرَا** for **أَرَا**; **أَرَا** for **أَرَا**; **أَرَا** for **أَرَا** (Eth. **ተማረመ**); **أَرَا** for **أَرَا** (Eth. **ተማረመ**); **أَرَا** for **أَرَا** (Eth. **ተማረመ**).

اَتَنُوم, مَتَمَلَا, اِهَضَمَلَا, σπόγγος; اِهَضَمَلَا, σχήμα; اِهَضَلَا,
 στολή; اسَطُول, στόλος.—At the end of a word this weak guttural
 is exceedingly apt to disappear altogether, particularly after
 a diphthong or a long vowel. Hence سَوَّ saw'un is vulgarly pro-
 nounced san سَو, Heb. שָׁי; شَيْ shai'un is vulgarly pronounced
 shai: compare in Heb. גַּי, גֵּי, constr. גַּיָּא, with
 suff. חֲמַא. In some of these cases, assimilation of the א to
 the previous sound formed the intermediate stage. For example,
 nabī' nabī'un¹ became first nabīyun¹, and then nábī, نَبِي.
 Hence, whilst the Hebrew holds fast נְבִיא (though with silent א),
 pl. נְבִיאִים, the Aramaic emphatic is بְּבִיא, with double
 y, for بְּבִיאָ, بְּבִיאָ. When preceded by a short vowel, the
 consonant *alif* is usually vocalised after the loss of its own
 proper vowel; e.g. قَرَأَ, مَلَأَ, مَلَأَ; قَرَأَ, مَلَأَ; قَرَأَ, مَلَأَ.
 —In Aramaic indeed א rarely appears as a substantial
 consonant, and in all possible cases throws back its vowel on
 a preceding letter, which is either vowelless or has a very short
 vowel; as سَأَلَ, نَسَأَلَ, مَأَلَ for سَأَلَ, مَأَلَ; مَأَلَ, مَأَلَ;
 اُحْأَفَ for اُحْأَفَ; اُحْأَفَ for اُحْأَفَ. In the middle of a word
 it may preserve its consonant power, especially when originally
 doubled, as اُحْأَفَ; but at the end of a word forms like اُحْأَفَ,
 are very rare. In some cases assimilation takes place, especially
 in the Ettafal of the verb, as اُحْأَفَ for اُحْأَفَ,
 for اُحْأَفَ. Similarly اُحْأَفَ, اُحْأَفَ;
 (from اُحْأَفَ).

¹ [Apparently a loanword from the Hebrew, through the Aramaic, in which the *hamza* was already lost: Nöldeke, *Gesch. des Qorāns*, p. 1; Guidi, *Sede*, p. 36; Fränkel, *Foreignword*, p. 232.]

א is prone to interchange with ה, particularly at the beginning of a word. Arabic and Aramaic have frequently א, where Hebrew has ה; e.g. אֶהָ - אֶהָ; אֶהָ - אֶהָ; ([but conversely] הֶהָ for הֶהָ); אֶהָ = אֶהָ (where Syriac also אֶהָ); אֶהָ, אֶהָ - אֶהָ, in passives and reflexives = אֶהָ - אֶהָ.

In Arabic, especially in the vulgar dialects, ا may interchange with و, as وَآخَذَ for وَآخَذَ, وَآخَذَ for وَآخَذَ, *widn* for وَآخَذَ, *wilf* for وَآخَذَ; وَآخَذَ for وَآخَذَ; *tarwīs*, "introductory formula," for وَآخَذَ; وَآخَذَ, and the verb وَآخَذَ for وَآخَذَ. Very rarely does it interchange with ي, as in *yasīr* for وَآخَذَ, *malān* for وَآخَذَ. Parallels to this latter permutation in Syriac are وَآخَذَ = وَآخَذَ; وَآخَذَ = وَآخَذَ.

2. ה does not require much remark after what has just been said of its interchange with א.—Occasionally it interchanges even in the ancient languages with ח, as חָבַהּ *bow down*, חָבַהּ (with ח) חָבַהּ. Also with ו; e.g. חָבַהּ and חָבַהּ *be bright, shine, burn*; חָבַהּ and חָבַהּ, *be ashamed*; חָבַהּ and חָבַהּ, *run*; חָבַהּ and חָבַהּ, [perhaps also] חָבַהּ and חָבַהּ, whence חָבַהּ and חָבַהּ.—On a substitution of ח for a primitive initial ש, I shall say something when we come to that letter.

3. Hebrew and Syriac ח we ought properly to distinguish, according to the Arabic and Assyrian, into ח and ח; as חָבַהּ *cut, plough*, חָבַהּ; חָבַהּ, *be deaf and dumb*, חָבַהּ. —In the Aramean dialects there is a strong inclination to weaken its sound to that of ה. Only the modern Syriac of Urūmiah exhibits the contrary tendency, and uses the rougher

جَدَفَ, and غَرِيَ *be angry*; جَلَبَة and غَلَبَة, *outcry*; جَدَفَ and غَدَفَ (dial.), *row*¹.

1. **ג** is hard in Hebrew, Aramaic, Assyrian, and Ethiopic, like our *g* in *go*, *give*, *get*; in Arabic its sound varies, for the Syrians pronounce it soft, like *g* in *gem*, whereas in Egypt and parts of Arabia the hard sound is retained, جَبَل, رَجُل. The Hebrew and Aramean, however, modified its sound, when immediately preceded by a vowel (however slight), into one much resembling that of the Greek *γ* between two strong vowels, as *ἀγαθός*, or the Arabic غ. Indeed, when writing Arabic with Hebrew letters, the Jews generally use ג to represent غ. Modern Syriac gives unaspirated ܓ the sound of *dy* or *j* in a few roots, such as ܕܝܢܝܐ *dyāniū* or *jāniū* (ܝܢܝܒ) “steal, carry off”; ܕܝܡܠܐ *dyūmla* or *jūmla*, “camel.” In a very few cases the Arabic soft *g* has been still further softened into *sh*; e.g., in Egypt the word *wishsh*, “face,” apparently = وَجْه. Similarly the old grammarian al-G’awālīkī mentions تَشْتَر as a faulty pronunciation of تَجْتَر, “it chews the cud².”

2. **כ** is also hard in Hebrew, Aramaic, Assyrian, Arabic and Ethiopic, like our *k*, as כָּתַב, כָּלַב, כָּהֵן. The Hebrew and Aramaic modify its sound, after a vowel, into one closely resembling that of the Arabic خ, as ܟܬܒ, ܟܠܒ (but Arabic يَكْتُب). Hence, when a Jew writes Arabic with Hebrew letters, he uses כ for خ.—In modern Syriac unaspirated *k* ܟ is said to have the sound of *ty* or *ch*, e.g., ܬܝܠܒܐ or ܫܠܒܐ; ܡܬܝܠܐ or ܡܠܫܐ; ܬܝܦܦܐ or ܫܦܦܐ.—In modern Arabic

¹ [These last seem to be loan-words, Fränkel, p. 227.]

² [*Livre des locutions vicieuses*, p. 145, in *Morgenl. Forschungen*, Leipz. 1875.]

ك is also softened dialectically into a sound like that of *ts* or *tsh*, sometimes of *dj* or *g*; as كَاتِب *t^{sh}ātib* or *tātib*, حَكِيم *haḡīm*, كَامِل *ḡāmil*.—In some Amharic words the old Ethiopic *k* has been aspirated, *kh*, and finally becomes *h*, e.g. *hōna*, “to become,” for *kōna*, كَان *hūlū*, “all,” for *kawēllū*, كَلَّ. Perhaps this may help us to connect such a form as Ar. أَيَا *īyā*, with Eth. ነያ *kīyā*.

3. *p* in the older dialects is a *k* pronounced far back in the mouth, or rather, deep in the throat. In our English alphabet its lineal representative is *q*. In some Arabic dialects it takes the sound of *dsh* or *dz*, sometimes of *ch* or *c*; e.g. قَبْلَه *dshiblē* or *dziblē*, قَرِيب *dsarīb*, عَقِيل *‘adsīl*, قَائِد *‘cā'id*, سَرَقَه *sir'ca*. But its ordinary sound, throughout Arabia and Africa, is that of a hard *g*. This too is common in the modern forms of Ethiopic, whence *Magdalā* for *Maḡdalā*, ጠጋዳላ, *tagābbala* for *taḡābbala*. In parts of Syria and Egypt, on the other hand, as well as in Amharic, *p* is apt to be converted into *ṣ*. A Syrian Christian says 'ult, 'a'ūl, for قُلْتُ, أَقُول; and a native of Shoa pronounces *ta'ābbala* instead of *tagābbala* or *taḡābbala*. The Egyptian railway station Zagazig is written زقازيق *Zaḡāzīq*, pronounced either *Zagāzīg* or *Za'āzī'*; the word حَقِيقِي *haḡīqī* becomes *ha'īz*.

III. We next come to the dentals ד, ת, ט, which are common to all the old languages: e.g.

דָּב, <i>ḏḏ</i> : Ass. <i>dubbu</i> ,	דָּב,	דָּבָא;
יָד, <i>īḏ</i> : Ass. <i>idu</i> (power),	יָד,	יָדָא;
תַּחַת, <i>ṭḥṭ</i> :	תַּחַת,	תַּחַתָּא;
טָישׁ,	טָישׁ,	טָישָׁא;

אֲתָן,	Ass. <i>atānu</i> ,	אֲתָן,	אֲתָן;
מַלְ,	מל:	מַלְ,	מַלְ;
טַעַם,	טוֹט:	טַעַם,	טַעַם;
חֲטִי,	חֲחִי:	Ass. <i>ikhti</i> ,	חֲחִי,

Of these, ת and ט interchange freely, as קטל, מלא, but
מלא, طغى; قتل and كذب; قتل and قتلت; قتل and قتل.
and התה, rarely טעה; חטף, סחף, and חתף. In
modern Syriac ܬܐ for ܬܐ. ܕ often interchanges with ת, as
in the Hebrew radicals תור and דור, Arabic تار and دار;
and ܕܢܝܦ, “shoulder,” for ܕܢܝܦ; in Mandaitic כארפא,
“silence,” for ܕܢܝܦ; and even כראב, as well as
כראב. More rarely does ܕ interchange with ט, as ܕܢܝܦ
and ܕܢܝܦ; אטד, אטד, and ܕܢܝܦ or ܕܢܝܦ, Mand. אמאמא;
טבור, “height, mountain,” Sam. ܬܒܪ, Eth. ተብረ; ܕܢܝܦ,
ܕܢܝܦ and ܕܢܝܦ, Of a possible interchange of ת
with ܕ, I shall have something to say when we come to speak
of the persons of the perfect in the verb. As another instance
I may mention the substitution of k for t in some modern
Syriac forms of the verb ܬܐ, “to come,” e.g., particip. ܬܐ and
ܬܐ (tyā, ityā), for ܬܐ and ܬܐ; imper. ܬܐ (tyā) for ܬܐ (t).

Of these three letters ת and ד undergo a slight modification in Hebrew and Aramaic, when immediately preceded by a vowel. In this position they receive a sound nearly approximating to *th* in *that* and *think* respectively; whence the Jews in writing Arabic use ד for ت and ת for ث. e.g. דִּבֵּן, דִּבֵּן; יִדְבֵּן, יִדְבֵּן.

very little difference is perceptible between them, particularly at the end of words. For instance, the particle *bit*, which forms the future tense (ܒܝܬ ܒܝܬ) is a contraction for ܒܝܬ, but usually written ܒܝܬ; the imperative of ܕܝܬ, “to do,” is written and pronounced ܕܝܬ *cut*, for ܕܝܬ; ܡܝܢܝܬ ܝܫܗܐ is pronounced nearly as *minnit ishō*; the old Syriac ܡܝܢܝܬ ܝܫܗܐ is pronounced and actually written ܡܝܢܝܬ ܝܫܗܐ.—Lastly, I may mention that the hard ܬ and ܕ of the ancient Ethiopic are changed in Amharic, in certain cases [where *y* or *i* follows], into *ty* or *ch*, and *dy* or *j*; e.g., in the 3rd pers. sing. fem. perf. of the verb *nabarach* “she was” (for ܢܒܪܚ: *nabarat* “she sat,” compare Spanish *ser*, for *seer*, *sedere*); ܝܝ for ܝܕ: ܝܕ “hand,” *wallāj* for ܡܠܝܕ: *wallādī* “father.”

Thus far I have spoken chiefly of the pure ܬ, ܢ, ܡ, which remain unchanged in all the old Semitic languages, and undergo comparatively slight alterations in the modern dialects, such changes depending mainly upon the aspiration of these letters in the older forms. Now, however, I must touch upon another set of modified dentals, which undergo in the old languages themselves a regular series of permutations.

Besides the simple dentals ܬ *t*, ܕ *d*, ܒ *b*, the old Arabic possesses a series of aspirated or lisped dentals, ܬ *th*, ܕ *dh*, ܒ *th*. These formed, I have no doubt, part of the protosemitic stock of sounds, which has been preserved in Arabic alone. In the other Semitic languages they underwent various modifications.

The Arameans, as a rule, dropped the difficult lisped sound altogether, and fell back upon the simple dental; e.g. ܬܒܪ *break*, ܬܪܝܢ *plough*, ܕܒܝܥ, ܕܒܝܕ, ܕܒܝܕ, ܕܒܝܕ; ܬܦܪ, ܬܦܪ, ܬܦܪ, ܬܦܪ. The other Semites took a different course, modifying the lisped letter into a sibilant. In Phoenician and Hebrew

ث became *sh*, in Ethiopic and Assyrian ḥ *s*¹; e.g. שׁוֹר, ثور^{שׁ}, ḥC: Ass. *sūr*; ثَقَل, ثَقُل, ḥC: (hang up), Ass. *isḫul* (hang up, weigh); ثوم^{שׁ}, garlic, ḥC: Ass. *sūmu*; حَرث, חָרַשׁ, חֲרָח: ḥC: (abundant crop). Similarly ذ became in all these languages *z*; e.g. ذَبَح, ذَبَح, H-ḥ: Ass. *zēbu* (for *zibḫu*); اَذَن, אָזַן, אָזַן: Ass. *uznu*; اَخَذَ, אָחַז, אָחַז: Finally, ظ appears in the other languages as *z*, *ṣ*; e.g. ظَلَمَ, צָלַמוּת, ḥC: Ass. *ṣalmu*, “dark”; ظَلَّ, צָל, ḥC: Ass. *ṣillu* and *ṣalūlu*; ظَنَر, צָנַר, צָנַר: Of course, as every rule has its exceptions, these series are occasionally liable to disturbances. For instance قِطَّاءَ cucumber, קִטְטָאִים, ḥC: Ass. *ḫissī*, ought by rule to be in Aramaic קִטְיָא; but the actual form is קִטְטָאִים, the proximity of ק having hardened the *t*.

Of the Aramaic dialects some have advanced to the Hebrew stage, at least in sporadic instances. In the great inscription of Taimā, for example, we find וי for וי, ון and its fem. וא for ון and וא; and the same forms occur in the Egyptian Aramaic inscriptions and papyri. In Mandaitic there are not only pronominal and adverbial forms of this kind, as האוּן, fem. האוּא (but האוּי *this is*, and occasionally האוּא); סִבְבִּי = האוּאךְ, then; האוּן, as well as האוּי, *how?* but also a few other words, as וּכְרָא or וּכְרָא, *male*, וּכְרָא or וּכְרָא, *offering* (but וּכְרָא *offerer*, וּכְרָא *altar*), וּכְרָא *beard*, and very strangely וּכְרָא as well as וּכְרָא, *palm tree*, and וּכְרָא as well as וּכְרָא, *blood*.

¹ [Of the two forms of *s* which are distinguished in Assyrian writing, though they seem to have ultimately come to be pronounced alike, the one which corresponds to ש = ث is that which Schrader and Delitzsch represent by *š*, while Sayce and other English scholars render it by simple *s*. See below, p. 58.]

Among the modern dialects the Arabic alone calls for notice. Generally speaking, it has adopted the same course as the old Aramaic, i.e. it retrogrades by changing the lisped into the simple dental; e.g. ^{تَوْر} *tōr*, "ox," ^{كَتِير} *ketīr*, ^{اِتْنَيْن} *itnēn*, ^{شَكَات} "beggar." More rarely it advances the *th* to a sibilant, *s*, as *sibit* = ^{ثَبَّتَ} *bāḥis* = ^{بَاحَثَ} (argue, dispute), *khabbās* = ^{خَبَّاثَ} (scoundrel). The word ^{حَدِيث} in the sense of *narrative*, *story*, is pronounced in Egypt *ḥadūt*, but in the sense of "religious tradition," *ḥadīs*. Even in ancient Arabic we occasionally find *t* for *th*, as in ^{تَبَرَّ} = ^{ثَبَّرَ}, ^{تَابَ} *repent*¹ = ^{ثَابَ} *return*. Similarly lisped ^ذ seems to become in modern Arabic either *d* or *z*; e.g. *dīb* = ^{ذَيْبٌ}, *dahab* = ^{ذَهَبٌ}, *adān* = ^{أَذَانٌ}, *kidb* and *kizb* = ^{كَذَبٌ}, *izn* = ^{إِذْنٌ}, *sikr* = ^{ذِكْرٌ} (recitation), *samb* = ^{ذَنْبٌ}. In like manner ^ظ is pronounced either *ḏ* (ض) or *z*, e.g. *ʿaḏm* = ^{عَظْمٌ}, *ḏill* = ^{ظَلٌّ}, *ḏalma* = ^{ظَلَمَةٌ}, *sulm* = ^{ظَلَمٌ}, *ḏuhr* = ^{ظَهْرٌ}, *sahar* = ^{ظَهْرٌ}, *ḥifz* = ^{حَفْظٌ}².

IV. The sibilants next engage our attention, viz. ^ז, ^ס, ^{שׁ} (^{שׂ}, ^{שׁ}), and ^ץ.

1. Pure *z* runs through all the Semitic languages, as ^{זָרַע}, ^{זָרַע}, ^{זָרַע}, Ass. *zēru* or *zīru*, "seed"; ^{עָזַר}, ^{עָזַר}, ^{עָזַר}, Ass. *issu*, "strong." But Eth. H, Heb. ^ז, and Ass. *z*, often correspond, as we have seen above, to Arab. ^ذ and Aram. ^ܕ; as ^{ذَيْبٌ}, ^{זַיב}, *zību*, ^{חַיָּה}: *hyaena*, ^{ܕܐܝܬܐ}.

¹ [In this sense and form the word is a loanword from the Aramaic ^{ܕܠܐ}, see Fränkel, *Lehneww.* p. 83.]

² [The distinctive sound of ^ظ is preserved in some parts of the Hijāz.]

As a rule, ש = ס = שׁ = שׂ; as

שִׁי	שִׂי	שִׁי:	שִׁי
שִׁי	שִׂי	שִׁי:	שִׁי

but there are exceptions [perhaps merely graphical], as

שִׁי, שִׁי, שִׁי [for שִׁי] but שִׁי, שִׁי.

Hebrew שׁ, as a general rule, corresponds to Arabic ش; and vice versâ, Arabic س corresponds to Hebrew שׁ. The Aramaic follows the Hebrew, writing of course ש for שׁ. E.g.

(1)	שִׁי	שִׁי	שִׁי	
	שִׁי	שִׁי	שִׁי	Assyr. šību (grey-haired)
	שִׁי	שִׁי	שִׁי	„ šumēlu (-īlu)
	שִׁי	שִׁי	שִׁי	
	שִׁי	שִׁי	שִׁי	
	שִׁי	שִׁי	שִׁי	„ irsu, ērsu
(2)	שִׁי	שִׁי	שִׁי	
	שִׁי	שִׁי	שִׁי	שִׁי:
	שִׁי	שִׁי	שִׁי	שִׁי:
	שִׁי	שִׁי	שִׁי	

similarly p. 56, l. 2 sqq., whereas on p. 14, l. 23 š is used in Schrader's sense. Elsewhere he writes *s* with *sh* above it, but on the whole he seems finally to have inclined to use *š* in Schrader's sense whenever it was desirable to indicate a distinction between the two forms of the sibilant. For the sake of uniformity this mode of transcription will be adopted in the following pages, without reference to variations in the MS., which would doubtless have been removed had Prof. Wright lived to see his work through the press.]

לִשָּׁן לִשָּׁן לִשָּׁן ḥāz: Assyr. *lišānu*

רִישׁ רִישׁ רִישׁ ḥāz: „ *rēšu, rīšu*

These rules are not, however, invariably observed. E.g.

שָׁלוֹם but [as a loanword] שָׁלוֹם (not שָׁלוֹם)

שָׁמֶשׁ but שָׁמֶשׁ (not שָׁמֶשׁ, except in some modern dialects), Assyrian *šamšu*.

There is another Hebrew ש, which corresponds to an Aramaic 𐤑, Arabic ث, Ethiopic ሰ, Assyrian *s* [š], of which I gave some examples above. Add :

שָׁלַג שָׁלַג שָׁלַג *šalgu*

שָׁרַח שָׁרַח שָׁרַח ḥāz:

שָׁדַח שָׁדַח שָׁדַח ḥāz: *u'addiš*

ש and ש, as well as ש, may occasionally interchange with ש, e.g. שָׁחַק, Eth. ሠጠፍ: or ሠጠፍ: , שָׁחַק, ሠጠፍ: , ሠጠፍ: (womb), Talm. הַיִּמְצָא and הַיִּמְצָא (fat of the intestines), Mand. ሠጠፍ: , ሠጠፍ: , ሠጠፍ: , ሠጠፍ: .

ש is frequently changed into ש under the influence of a following ש, and in Arabic of a ر or ق or غ; as صَخْر, صَخْر, صَخْر, صَخْر; especially in foreign words with *sz*, as ሠጠፍ: or ሠጠፍ: .

Very curious is the change in Assyrian of š into *l* before a dental; e.g. *aštur* or *aštur* (שָׁטַר), *maštītu* or *maltītu* (drink, שָׁתַּה), *khamišti* or *khamilti* (five, חָמֵשׁ), *lubuštu* or *lubultu* (dress, לָבַשׁ). It appears, however, to be thoroughly well established.

Lastly, it would seem that an initial *s* may in certain cases interchange with ש, and later with ש. This is most obvious in

the verbal form **مَضَا**, Heb. **הִפְעִיל**, Ar. **أَفْعَلَ**, Aram. **أَحْضَا**; and in the pronouns of the 3rd pers., Ass. *šu*, f. *ši*, pl. *šunu*, f. *šina*; in the suffix forms *šu*, *ša*, pl. *šunu*, *šina*. The Ḥimyaritic offers us a suffix form **שׁוּ**, pl. **שׁם**, as well as **הוּ**, pl. **המוּ**. The other Semitic languages have all the *h*-form, except the modern Mehri, which has, according to von Maltzan¹, masc. *he*, f. *sê*, pl. *hêm*, f. *sên*; as suffixes *he*, f. *es*, pl. *hum*, f. *senu*. Such cases as **הָלַךְ**, **הָלַךְ**, **סָלַךְ**, are very rare, and may either be accidental or capable of some other explanation.

3. We have already seen that **ץ** may be weakened into the other sibilants **שׁ**, **ס**, **ז**; and we have also shown that it corresponds in Ethiopic, Phœnician, Hebrew, and Assyrian, to the Arabic **ظ**, which is represented in Aramaic by **ܐ**, **ܐ**. One or two additional examples may not be superfluous.

צָבִי	Assyr. <i>šabītu</i> ,	ظَبِي	مُضَا
צָהָרִים		ظَهَر	مُסִי
צָעַן migrate (Is. 33. 20)	}	ظَعَن	804:
צָעַן load		travel	load
			carry.

I now remark that **ץ** in Hebrew may correspond

(a) To Arabic **ص**, Ethiopic **ፀ**, Assyrian **ṣ**, Aramaic **ܣ**; as

צָד	صَاد	isūd	ፀ?
צָבַע	أَصْبَعَ	፳፻፬፬፮:	ṣumbu (for <i>ṣubbu = ṣubbu</i>)
בְּצָלִים	بَصَلَ	፬፻፩:	ṣulā
נָצַב	نَصَب		ṣab

(b) To Arabic **ض** Ethiopic **ፀ**, Assyrian **ṣ**, Aramaic **ܣ**; as

צָרָה	ضَرَّة	ፀፈ:	ḥabā
צָמַר		ፀ፫ፈ:	ḥamā

¹ [ZDMG., vol. xxv. (1871) p. 200 sq.]

צַק	צֶאֱק		חֻ
צִנָּן	צִנָּן	ṣēnu, ṣīnu	חֻנָּן
	צִרְס	θḥ :	חֻמָּא
רִצִּין	רִצִּין		רִצִּין
פִּצִּין	פִּצִּין		פִּצִּין
יִצָּא		ḫḫ : ḫḫ (‘‘he escaped’’) part. āṣū	יִצָּא
רִצָּה	רִצִּי	(‘‘satisfied’’)	רִצָּה
בִּיצָה	בִּיצָה	bīṣu	בִּיצָה
אֶרֶץ	אֶרֶץ	irṣitu (ēr-)	אֶרֶץ

If another **ע** follows in the word, then this Aramaic **ע** is commonly weakened into **ס**; e.g.

עִלָּע	עִלָּע	ṣilu (for ṣillu, ṣil'u)	עִלָּע	עִלָּע
יִי הַעֲלֵעִים	עִלָּע		אֶפְעָא (אֶפְעָא)	אֶפְעָא
	עִרָע		עִרָע	עִרָע
	עִנָּע			עִנָּע
עִנָּע	עִנָּע		עִנָּע	עִנָּע
עִנָּע	עִנָּע	Assyr. iṣṣu	עִנָּע	עִנָּע

There are however some exceptions to this rule; e.g.

צִמָּר	צִמָּר	θḥ :	צִמָּר
נִפְצִין	נִפְצִין	ḫḫ : ‘‘to be scattered, flee’’ (with ḫ, not θ)	נִפְצִין

רָצִין	רָצַ	רָצַ
עָרַץ	עָרַץ	עָרַץ
גָּמַץ	גָּמַץ	גָּמַץ
זָרַע	Assyr. <i>siru</i>	זָרַע
זָרַק		זָרַק
חָמַץ	חָמַץ	חָמַץ and חָמַץ
חָמַץ	} with <i>צ</i> , not <i>ר</i> ²	חָמַץ
חָמַץ		חָמַץ
חָמַץ		חָמַץ

In such cases some of the younger dialects seem to be, as it were, faintly conscious of their loss, and strive to make good the defect in different ways. Sometimes a *ק*, or the combination *אק*, takes the place of the *ע*; as in *אַרְקָא* for *אַרְעָא* (Jerem. x. 11), Mand. *אַקנא* for *אַנְנָא*, *אַקאמרא* for *אַמְרָא*. Occasionally the same thing happens in the case of a simple *ע*, as *עַפְרָא*, *עַפְרָא*, Mand. *אַפְרָא*, but also *אַקאפְרָא*, and even *אַנְנָאפְרָא*. At other times a *ל* appears upon the scene; e.g. *עַפְרָא* “to press, squeeze,” *אַפְרָא* *be oppressed*, instead of *אַפְרָא*; *אַפְרָא*, Syriac *אַפְרָא*, Talm. *אַפְרָא*, for *אַפְרָא*. This last word, owing to the difficulty of its utterance, undergoes some curious modifications. The regular Aramaic form is found in Talmudic and Mandaitic, viz. *אַפְרָא* (not *Af'el*), *אַפְרָא*, “I laughed”; but also *אַפְרָא* (*אַפְרָא*), and even *אַפְרָא*. Something similar occurs in Syriac with the word *אַפְרָא*, *אַפְרָא*, whence are formed the secondary radicals *אַפְרָא* and *אַפְרָא*.

¹ [This example is however disputed by G. Hoffmann, *ZDMG.*, xxxii. 762.]

² [See however Fränkel, *Fremdw.*, p. 183.]

Before going further let us examine by the light of these permutations the Hebrew radical **צפר**. You will find that it represents no less than four different radicals in Arabic and Ethiopic.

- (1) **צפר** "whistle, twitter," **صَفَر**, whence
צפור, **צִפּוֹר**, **צִפּוֹרִים**, **צִפּוֹרִי**, Ass. *išṣūr* (for *išpūr*).
 (2) **צפר** "turn, return, twine, twist," **ضَفَر**, 𐤆𐤌𐤓: whence
צפירה "turn, crown or garland."
 (3) **צפר** "leap, spring," **ضَفَر**, whence
צפיר "he goat," **צִפּוֹרִי**, **צִפּוֹרִים**.
 (4) **צפר** **ظفر**, whence
צפרן "nail," **ظَفَر**, 𐤆𐤌𐤓: Ass. *ṣupru*, **צִפּוֹרִי**.

Perhaps we may add in Aramaic, by interchange of **צ** and **ט**,

- (5) **צפרא**, **צִפּוֹרִי**, "dawn" = **שִׁפְרָא** from radical **שפר**.

V. The labials **ב** *b* and **פ** *p* interchange freely with one another; as also **ב** *b* and *m*.

1. *b* and *p*: **פּוֹרֶלֶת**, **פּוֹלֶלֶת**, Ass. *parzillu*, Ar. **فِرْزَل** *fetter*,
*forceps*¹.

פּוֹרֶלֶת, **פּוֹלֶלֶת**, **פּוֹרֶלֶת**

פּוֹרֶלֶת, **פּוֹלֶלֶת**, **פּוֹרֶלֶת**

פּוֹרֶלֶת, **פּוֹלֶלֶת**

פּוֹרֶלֶת, **פּוֹלֶלֶת**

Particularly when the letter *t* **ת** follows; as **פּוֹרֶלֶת** or **פּוֹלֶלֶת**,

¹ [This last according to Guidi, *Sede*, p. 18, Fränkel, p. 153, is a loanword from the Aramaic.]

² [Loanword from the Aramaic according to Fränkel, p. 153.]

زَفَتْ "pitch"¹; حَڤْلَا for حَڤْلَا; ڤَڤْلَا for ڤَڤْلَا; even when a vowel intervenes, as Mand. פת for פת, פתולא for פתולא.

2. *b* and *m*: מַכֵּן, בָּחַן.

אֲחַלָּא: זִמָּן, זִמָּן or זִמָּן, זִמָּן.

The Arab grammarians mention such cases as مَكَّة for مَكَّة, مَا آسَمَكْت for مَا آسَمَكْت; and the like. In Himyaritic בַּן stands for מִן, *who*, and בַּן for מִן, *from*.

A slight aspiration of ב *b* and פ *p* modifies these sounds into *v* and *f*. Hebrew and Aramaic have both sounds, the latter after a vowel, and indicate the difference merely by points. Arabic and Ethiopic have only *b* and *f*; Assyrian only *b* and *p*. The sound of *p* is one of extreme difficulty to an Arab. The Ethiopic ጸ *p* and ፒ *p* (or *ps*) are in native words usually modifications of an original *b*, sometimes of an *f*.

(1) نَجَبًا, صَبًا; يَنْبِجًا, بَنْبَجًا;

ܢܢܚ: ܢܢܚܐ; ܢܢܚܐ: ܢܢܚܐ;

(2) פָּדָה, פָּדָה;

ܦܕܐ: ܦܕܐ; ܦܕܐ: ܦܕܐ;

In modern Syriac, I may remark, *f* is generally hardened into *p*, as ܦܠܥܢܐ *malpānū* for ܦܠܥܢܐ. The modern Ethiopic dialects, on the contrary, such as Tigrīña and Amharic, possess the aspirated *b*, or *v*.

In Assyrian an original *m* passes into aspirated *b*, or *v*, as in *argamānu* or *argavānu*, "purple," Heb. אֶרְגָּמָן, Aram. אֶרְגָּמָן; *surmēnu* or *survēnu*, "a sort of cypress," Aram. שׁוּרְבִּינָא, שׁוּרְבִּינָא, modern Arabic شَرِبِين; *arakh-šamnu* (*samnu*), "eighth month,"

¹ [The Arabic is a loanword, Fränkel p. 151.]

or *šavnu* (*savnu*), Heb. מֶרְחָשׁוֹן. These two letters, *m* and *v*, are not distinguished from each other in Assyrian writing.

The aspirated *b* and *p*, that is to say *v* and *f*, are liable to undergo a further change, viz. into *w* (ו, ֹו). Examples of this are comparatively rare in the older dialects; e.g. מַעְבָּל, מַעְבָּל, for מַעְבָּל, מַעְבָּל; רַבְרָבִין, רַבְרָבִין, for רַבְרָבִין, רַבְרָבִין; כּוֹכֵב, for כּוֹכֵב, כּוֹכֵב; but Hiph. הוֹשִׁיט, הוֹשִׁיט, but Hiph. הוֹשִׁיט, הוֹשִׁיט. In some of the modern dialects, on the contrary, this change is common. We find it, for instance, in Amharic, e.g. ሰው: *saw*, “man,” for ሰብላ: *sabē*; ንብረ: *navāra* and ንቦራ: *nōra* (for *navra*, *navra*). But especially is it common in modern Syriac, where aspirated *b* is constantly treated as = *o*, *w*, and often wholly disappears; e.g. ܐܢܬܐ *ânā*, “time”; ܓܘܪܐ *gōrā*, “husband”; ܕܝܬܐ *diṯshā*, “honey”; ܬܝܢܐ *tiṯnā*, “straw”; ܬܡܠܐ for ܬܡܠܐ, *khūlā*, “debt”; ܬܡܠܐ for ܬܡܠܐ, *khūyā*, “darkness”; ܡܬܬ for ܡܬܬ, *shūṭ*, “let alone,” “pardon.” The same remarks apply to *f*, in the few cases in which it is not hardened into *p*; e.g. ܢܫܐ *nōshā*, for ܢܫܐ; ܪܫܬܐ *rūshṭā*, “winnowing shovel,” for ܪܫܬܐ.

A curious change in Arabic is that of *th* into *f*; e.g. ^ثثم, “then,” ^{ثوم}ثوم, “garlic,” ^{ثور}ثور, “interstice” (between the crosshandles of a bucket), ^{ثد}ثد, ^{ثد}ثد, “stuttering, stammering”; ^{ثدام}ثدام, “a cloth used as a strainer”; ^{ثاور}ثاور, “calamity”; ^{ثغور}ثغور and ^{ثغور}ثغور, “sweet sap” or “gum” issuing from certain plants; ^{ثدف}ثدف, ^{ثدف}ثدف, “a tomb” (connected with ^{ثدف}ثدف “a stook”). Compare the substitution of *f* in Russian for the Greek *θ*; e.g. *Feodor* for *Theodore*, *Afinui* for *Athens*, etc.

VI. The liquids ל, נ, ר, and the letter מ, interchange freely.

(1) ל with נ, and vice versâ: לחש and נחש; לשפה and נשפה; נרן, Aramaic נרן and נרן; להוא and נסון; Talmud. סכס for הלין הני, לחמא for נחמא, לקט for נקט.

(2) ל with ר, and vice versâ: ארמלה, ארמלה, ארמלה, Ethioptic plur. : ארמלה, ארמלה, ארמלה, (for ארמלה): Mand. ארמלה for ארמלה, and ארמלה for ארמלה; ארמלה, ארמלה, ארמלה, Mand. ארמלה, but Aram. ארמלה.

(3) נ with ר, and vice versâ: נר and ארמלה; ארמלה and ארמלה; ארמלה and ארמלה.

(4) מ with נ; as מורג *tribulum* (threshing-machine), نورج (Syriac נורג "axe"): מורג and מורג. Especially at the end of words; e.g. מורג, מורג, Arab. مبرم, مبرم, مبرم, مبرم. So in the pronouns, انتم, ان, ان, "if," אם: אם, אם, אם, אם. So in the plural terminations of the noun, Arab. مرون, مرون, Aram. מרון, מרון; in the dual, Arab. مرون, مرون; Aram. מרון, מרון, Heb. מים; in the dual, Arab. مرون, מرون; Aram. מרון, מרון, Heb. מים.

Final ם and ן are apt to fall away:—

(1) In the *construct* state of nouns dual and plural.

(2) In the *absolute* plural of nouns, not only in Talmudic, Mandaitic, and modern Syriac, but also in Assyrian, where we have such plurals as *malkî* "kings," *ilî* "gods," *pagrî* "bodies".³

¹ [But see *Journ. of Phil.* xiv. 115.]

² [Probably from a Persian word *nîdāna*; Nöld. in *G. G. A.* 1884, p. 1022.]

³ [Or also, according to Haupt and Delitzsch, *malkê* etc.]

In Hebrew a few cases may perhaps be found, both in the plural and dual, but they are doubtful.

(3) In the 2nd and 3rd pers. plural imperfect masc. and fem. of the verb; e.g. Arab. *يَقْتُلْنَ*, *يَقْتُلُونَ*; Heb. *יִקְטְלוּ*, *יִקְטְלנה* (ת); Syr. *ܩܬܠܘܢ*, *ܩܬܠܘܢܗ*; but in vulgar Arabic, and more commonly in Hebrew, *يَقْتُلُوا*, *يَقْتُلُون*; and in Ethiopic, *የቀጥሉ* : *የቀጥሉ* :: So also in Assyrian we find the termination *ānu* or *ūni*, as well as the shorter *ū*.

(4) In various other instances. For example, *ם* in the 2nd pers. plural perf. of the verb; *קָטַלְתֶּם* compared with *קָטַלְתָּ*, vulg. Arab. *قَتَلْتُمْ* for *قَتَلْتَا*. Again, Talmud. *קָא* or *קָא*, for *מִיָּד*; *תִּיקוּם*, *נִיקוּם*, *לִיקוּ*, fem. *לִיקוּ*, *נִיקוּ*, *קָאִים* for *מִידִים* (מִידִים, *מִידִים*, Mand. *מִנְדִּים* and *מִנְדִּים*).—*ן* in such Hebrew words as *מְגִדוֹן* and *מְגִדוֹ*; *שִׁילָה* and *גִּילָה* for *שִׁילוֹן*, *גִּילוֹן*, as proved by the adjectives *שִׁילָנִי*, *גִּילָנִי*; etc. Much more frequently in the later dialects; as Talm. *הָלִין* for *הָלִין*, *הָנִי* for *הָנִין*; *מָאֲרִין* and *הָאֲרִין* for *מָאֲרִין* and *הָאֲרִין*; Mand. *דִּאֲנִילוֹן* for *נִהָרוֹן* בִּיה *נִהָרוֹבִיה*; *אֲמִאֲרִתוֹן* לִי for *אֲמִאֲרִתוֹלִי*; *דִּאֲנִין* לָהוֹן (*נִסְבֵּת*, *חֹס*).

Initial *n*, when pronounced with the shortest vowel, is liable to be dropped in Hebrew and Aramaic, particularly in the imperative of verbs *פִּן* (*פִּן*, *פִּן*), of which more hereafter. Initial *m* too, according to some scholars, is occasionally rejected in Hebrew, in the participle Pu'al, *לִקַּח*, *יִלְד*; whence we can explain the modern Syriac form *ܥܒܕܐ* as standing for *ܥܒܕܐ*.

Lastly, medial *ל*, *נ*, *ר* are exceedingly apt to be assimilated

to a following letter; and conversely ɲ and ɳ are frequently employed, especially in the younger dialects, for the purpose of dissimilating the component elements of a double consonant.

[illegible][illegible]

VII. The weak letters γ and ω would easily furnish me with material for more than one lecture, if I entered into a minute account of all their changes and vicissitudes. At present, however, I intend to dwell only upon a few points of primary importance.

Initial *y* runs through all the dialects, though in comparatively few words; e.g.

יֵשׁ	ישׁ	יֵשׁ	ישׁ	יֵשׁ	ישׁ
יום	יום	יום	יום	יום	יום
יֵשׁ	ישׁ	יֵשׁ	ישׁ	יֵשׁ	ישׁ
יום	יום	יום	יום	יום	יום
יֵשׁ	ישׁ	יֵשׁ	ישׁ	יֵשׁ	ישׁ
יום	יום	יום	יום	יום	יום

“hand,” Eth. አድ:; *arkhu*, “month,” ירח, חַסֵּל, ܡܠܚ:; *āsib* “he dwells, dwelling,” יֵשֵׁב; *āsū*, “going out,” יֵצֵא; *ālīdtu*, *ālittu*, “bearing,” יֵלֶדֶת, וְאֵלֶדֶת; *akru*, “costly,” יָקָר. Nor is this dislike of the sound of initial *y* or *w* confined to Assyrian. Even the Arabs were prone to change initial *w* into *u* and *wi* into *i*; and the combination *waawā* is always modified at the beginning of a word into *’awā*. So in the Kōr’ān we find اقْتَت for وَقَت; further, اِسَاد for وَسَاد, “cushion”; اِشَاح for وَشَاح, “belt”; اَوَاصِل for وَوَاصِل, plural of وَاَصِلَة, “connecting link, proximate cause”; اَوَاتِي for وَوَاتِي, plural of وَاَقِيَة, whether in the sense of “guard” or of “ounce.” Hence we see at once the connexion, on the one hand, between اَرَخ, “to date,” and Eth. ܡܠܚ: “month”; اِصِيل “joint,” and وِصَل, where the *w* is original; and, on the other hand, between يَكْف and اَلَف, “learn”; يَنْز and اَنْز, “be long,” where the *n* claims the priority.

Of the disappearance of initial *w* in some verbal and nominal forms, I shall treat hereafter, when we come to the verbs פ"י in the Hebrew Grammar.

Medial *w* and *y* are chiefly liable to change under the influence of a preceding and following vowel, which lead to their vocalisation, and in some cases to their entire disappearance. E.g.

Perf.	قَامَ	ቁጠ:	קָם	כַּמ	for <i>karwama</i> ,
		ሀጠ:	שָׁם	כַּמ	for <i>sayama</i> ;
Imperf.	يَقُومُ	ይቁጠ:	יְקוֹם	נַכַּמ	for <i>yakwumu</i> ,
		ይሀጠ:	יְשִׁים	נַכַּמ	for <i>yasyimu</i> .

Compare also *מַטָּה*, *מַתָּה*, *מַטָּה*, for *marwita*; and *טָלָה*, for *ṭawula*, with *בּוֹשֶׁת* and *אֹרֶז*, for *בּוֹשֶׁת* and *אֹרֶז*. Uncontracted examples are, however, to be found; as *עֹרֶב* “be blind of one eye,” *חֹל* “squint,” *חֵיפ* “have a slender waist,” *גִּזְע*, *חֹר*, *רוּחַ*, *זֶסוּ*, *חֹל*; and the contraction does not take place when the 3rd radical is likewise a *w* or *y*, as *רֹוּחַ*, *רֹוּחַ*, *רֹוּחַ*; etc.

Medial *w* passes into *y* chiefly under the influence of an accompanying *i*, as *صَمِّمًا* *قِيَامَةً*, “resurrection” (where the Arabic *i* has become a mere *shwā* in Syriac), for *قَرَامَةً*. Instances like *חֹרָה*, Aram. *חֹרָה*, *חֹרָה*, Arab. *هَوِي*, are rare. In the Hebrew Pi‘ēl and Aramaic Pa‘ēl the change is more frequent: as *קָיִים*, *חֵיב*, *חֵיב*, *חֵיב*, *חֵיב*; but examples to the contrary are not wanting, as *עָוֶר*, “surround,” *עָוֶר*, *עָוֶר*, *עָוֶר*, *עָוֶר*, *עָוֶר*. As the original form is the Arabic *ḥawwama*, the change perhaps began with the 2nd *w*, which passed into *y*, *ḥawyama*; this worked upon the preceding *w*, so as to cause assimilation, *ḥayyama*; and hence arose the Aramaic form *ḥayyēm*, and finally the Hebrew *ḥayyēm*, as we shall afterwards see in more detail.

Final *w*, when it appears at all as a consonant, is generally found in the shape of *y*; e.g. in Hebrew *יְכַסְּיוּ*, “they cover them.” Its retention in such forms as *שָׁלוּ*, “be quiet,” is rare; for even the Arabic, which tolerates *حَلَو*, requires *رَصِيَ* and *سَلِيَ* for *رَضَو* and *سَلَو*. In *שָׁלוּ*, *יְכַסְּיוּ*, *יְכַסְּיוּ*, and the like, we should probably pronounce the final *ו* nearly as *ū*; as also in the forms with pronom. suffixes, like *פָּיו* *אֵלַי* (for *פִּיהוּ*) or *דְּבָרָיו* *דֶּלְהָרָא* (for *דְּבָרָהוּ*). This view derives some confirma-

tion from ancient Hebrew seals, on which we read such inscriptions as :

לְשַׁבְּנִיהוּ עֶבֶד עֲזִיהוּ i.e. לְשַׁבְּנִי עֶבֶד עֲזִי

לְאַבְיָהוּ עֶבֶד עֲזִיהוּ i.e. לְאַבִּי עֶבֶד עֲזִי

In the perfect of the verb the Ethiopic alone retains the distinction of the final radicals, e.g. ተለወ: *taláwa*, "follow," በሐየ: *bakáya*, "weep." In the other languages the *w* has been changed into *y*, and the combination *aya* contracted into *â*. In Arabic the grammarians have introduced an arbitrary distinction, and write تلا for *taláwa* and بكى for *bakáya*, but the sound is the same in both cases, *talâ*, *bakâ*: and hence the Aramean has ܬܠܐ, ܠܐ, with ܐ, ܝ. In Hebrew a ה is substituted for this ܐ, תלה, נכה; but this does not warrant us in speaking of them as verbs לה. The only real verbs לה in Hebrew are such as נטה, נטה, in Syriac ܬܠܐ, ܠܐ, and the like. Upon the whole subject of the weak letters, and ي I shall find it necessary to enter into fuller details, when we come to the classes of verbs in which they appear as first, second and third radicals.

Having thus gone through the various classes of letters in the Semitic alphabet, and enumerated the principal changes to which they are liable in the different Semitic languages, I will conclude this branch of my subject by briefly recapitulating those permutations which are of primary importance, any deviation from which must be regarded with a careful scrutiny before we accept the relationship of the words in question. In so doing, I shall follow the order of the Hebrew alphabet.

1. ה = *h* in all the languages; but also
 ה init. = Assy. ܗ, Arab. ھ, Eth. አ, Aram. ܗ, ܝ.
2. ז = *z* in all the languages; but also
 ז = Assy. ܝ, Eth. ዘ, Arab. ڙ, Aram. ܝ, ܝ.
3. מ = Aram. ܡ, ܡ, Eth. ሠ, Arab. ڡ, Assy. ܡ (as *imêru*);
 but also
 מ = Aram. ܡ, ܡ, Eth. ሠ, Arab. ڡ, Assy. ܡ (*h*).

4. ' init. = *y* in all the languages except Assyrian, where it is **𐤢**; but also
' init. = Aram. ' , Eth. **፬**, Arab. **ي**, Assy. **𐤢**.
5. **𐤄** = Aram. **𐤄**, **𐤅**, Eth. **ሰ**, Arab. **س**, Assy. *s* (*sh*).
6. **𐤆** = Aram. **𐤆**, **𐤇**, Eth. **ዐ**, Arab. **ع**, Assy. **𐤢**; but also
𐤆 = Aram. **𐤆**, **𐤇**, Eth. **ዐ**, Arab. **غ**, Assy. **𐤢**.
7. **𐤇** = *s* in all the languages; but also
𐤇 = Eth. **፪**, Arab. **ظ**, Aram. **ܥ**, **ܥ**, Assy. **𐤆**;
𐤇 = Eth. **፬**, Arab. **ض**, Aram. **𐤆**, **𐤇**, **𐤈**, Assy. **𐤆**;
𐤇 = Eth. **፬** (**፪**), Arab. **ض**, Aram. **𐤆**, **𐤇**, Assy. **𐤆**.
8. **𐤈** = Aram. **𐤈** [**ש'**], **𐤉**, Eth. **ሠ**, Arab. **ش**, Assy. **𐤉** (*s*).
9. **𐤉** = Aram. **𐤉**, Eth. **ሰ**, Arab. **س**, Assy. **𐤉** (*s*); but also
𐤉 = Eth. **ሰ**, Arab. **ث**, Aram. **ܬ**, **ܬ**, Assy. **𐤉**.

¹ [Biblical Aramaic and the oldest Aramaic monuments have **𐤈**=**𐤉**. In Palmyrene this **𐤈** interchanges with **𐤈**, e.g. **𐤌𐤎𐤏𐤓** and **𐤌𐤎𐤏𐤓**.]

CHAPTER V.

THE VOWELS AND THEIR PERMUTATIONS.

WE now go on to treat of the vowels and their permutations, a topic which I must, however, handle in a somewhat superficial manner; as time forbids me to enter into more than the most necessary details. In fact, a mere outline of the subject is all that I can pretend to lay before you. Your own reading and reflection must do the rest; and I recommend to you, at present, the Grammars of Olshausen, Bickell (translated by Curtiss), and Stade, as being, on the whole, the most suggestive and the best adapted to your present purpose.

The vowel-system of the Semitic languages, like that of the Indo-European¹, was at first very simple. There were only three primitive vowel-sounds, *a*, *i*, *u*, which might naturally be either short or long, thus giving rise to six vowels:

ă ā, ĭ î, ŭ ū.

Of real primitive diphthongs, like the Indo-European *ai* and *au*, we can hardly speak in Semitic; for a careful examination will, I think, shew us that in every case the second element in a Semitic *ai* or *au* was originally the consonant *y* or *w*. Still, it is convenient in this place to treat *ai* and *au* as being practically diphthongs, and I shall therefore so regard them, with the reservation already mentioned. It may perhaps be well to use in writing *ay* and *aw* instead of *ai* and *au*.

No one of the Semitic languages, however, is exactly restricted to this limited number of vowel-sounds, in the state in which we

¹ [This passage appears to have been written before the general acceptance, among comparative philologists, of the new doctrine of the Indo-European vowels which recognises primitive *e* and *o*.]

are acquainted with it, save perhaps the Assyrian, which seems to designate in writing only the six vowels above mentioned. The Arabic, it is true, also exhibits in writing only the same six vowels, but we know that the actual range of the spoken language is far wider; and probably the same held good in regard to the Assyrian, which is unfortunately, as a spoken tongue, wholly beyond our ken.

Beginning, then, with the Arabic, we find that the ancient *ā ī ū* are capable of modification in sound, chiefly according to the nature of the consonants with which they are in juxtaposition.

In connexion with one of the gutturals, ع ح خ, or with the letter ر, *ā* retains its broad sound, as حَدّ *ḥadd*, خَمَر *khāmr*, لَعِب *lāb*, مَبْلَغ *mablagh*, رَبّ *rabb*, فَرَس *faras*: whilst with one of the emphatic or harsh consonants, ق ط ظ ض ص, it inclines to a duller, more obscure sound, somewhat like that of the broad Scotch *a* (*ā*) or the English *u* in *but*: e.g. بَقِي *bāḳiya*,

طَلَب *tālaba*, مَطَر *māṭār*, ضَرَب *ḍaraba*, صَدْر *ṣadr* (*ṣu*), بَطْن *baṭn* (*bu*).

Also with *w*, as وَلَد *wāḷad*, أَوَّل *awwal* (nearly *auwul*). Under the same circumstances *ī* has likewise a duller sound, with the gutturals, especially ع and ح, inclining more to *e* pronounced far back in the mouth, and with ق ط ظ ض ص to that of the deep Turkish *y* or English *i* in *bird*, as عَلِم *‘ilm*, سَحَر *sehr*, حَبِر *ḥabr*:

كَيْسَر *kyshr*, كَيْسَا *kyssah*, طَبّ *tybb*, اِضْرِب *ydrīb*: whilst *ū* inclines to

ō, or with ح and ع to *ö*, as ظَفَر *ḍufr*, لَطْف *laṭofa*, لُفْ *loṭf*,

حَسَن *ḥosn* or *hösn*, رَعْب *ro‘b*, عَمْر *‘ömr*, حَكِي *ḥōkiya*. The same

influences operate upon the long vowels: as صَاحِب *ṣāḥib*, طَاهِر *ṭāḥir*,

صَاحِب *ṣāḥib*, نَظَّارَة *naẓḍāra* (spectacles), وَاعِظ *wāḡiḥ*: حِيلَة *ḥayla*, سَاحِب *ṣāḥib*,

طَوْر *ṭūr*, طِين *ṭyn*, هَيْل *ḥyle*.

Again, in connexion with the other consonants, whether in a shut or open syllable, *ä* takes a weaker sound, like that of the common English *ä* (in *hat*, *cap*), or it becomes *ä*, *e* (as in *Männer*, *pet*); whilst *ī* and *ū* are pronounced with their natural sounds, as in *pin* and *bull*, or nearly so. E.g. كَتَبْتُ *katabtu*,

مَرْكَبٌ *markeb*, سَمَكٌ *semek*, شَمْسٌ *shems*, ذِكْرٌ *dhikr*, كُلٌّ *kull*.

The sound of *ü* was also heard dialectically in old Arabic, as

شُدٌّ *shüdda*, رُدٌّ *rüdda*, for *shüdda*, *rüdda*; سَيْقٌ *sūka*, قَيْلٌ *kūla*;

and is found occasionally in the vulgar dialects, as *küll* for *kūll*; in this latter case perhaps under the influence of the Turkish.

In a short open syllable, followed by a long one, the short vowels are liable to be modified and reduced almost to the compass of the Hebrew *shēvā*: e.g. سَمِينٌ *sēmīn*, جَلِيلٌ *jēlīl*,

مَدِينَةٌ *mēdīneh*, مَبَارَكٌ *mūbārāk*, of which the first two are

sometimes vocalised *sīmīn*, *jīlīl*, whilst the last is vulgarly pronounced *m'bārāk* or, with a prosthetic vowel, *ēmbārāk*. In modern dialects, e.g. that of Egypt, *a* becomes *i* even in a shut

syllable, e.g. مَن *mīn*, for مَنْ “who?” اَسْوَدٌ *asūd* for اَسْوَدٌ “black,” اَسْلَمَ

for اَسْلَمَ “became a muslim,” اِغْزَا *igzā* for اِغْزَا “parts.” It is also liable to be changed into *u*, under the influence of a proximate

b, *f*, *m* or *w*, e.g. مِلْهَابٌ *mīlhabbe*, مِلْوَعْدَةٌ *mīrwedde* for مِلْوَعْدَةٌ *gūwār* for جَوَار female slaves; similarly, مُفْتَاحٌ *muftāḥ* for حِمَصٌ *ḥimṣ*.

Just as *ä* was thus modified into *ä* *ē* *ī*, so did *ā* pass into *ē* and even into *ī*. A word like خَاتَمٌ or غَانِلٌ suffered no change;

but the weaker sound in كِتَابٌ *kītāb*, رِكَابٌ *rikāb*, لَاكِنٌ *lākīn*, underwent a modification into *kītēb*, *rikēb*, *lēkīn*, and among the

Arabs of Africa and Spain into *ī*, so that لِسَانٌ *lisān* and بَابٌ *bāb* became *lisīn* and *bīb*. Hence the Spanish names *Jaen* and

נַעֲשֶׂתָהּ with נִגְלָה and fem. נִגְלָתָהּ; יָד, with יָדְכֶם (יְדֹכֶם); דָּם, with דַּמְכֶם (דַּמְכֶם); דִּבְרִי, for דִּבְרִי, from דָּבָר (for *dābār*); חָרָה from חָר. These examples are taken, you will observe, almost exclusively from shut syllables, or half-shut syllables before the tone. In such cases the Syriac often ranges itself on the side of the Arabic: مَضْحَكًا, مَضْحَكًا, etc.; whilst at other times it is the Arabic which exhibits the weakening of the vowel, as Heb. צָדִיק, Arab. صَدِيق; Heb. and Syr. تَلْمִיד, Arab. تَلْمِيز. This change has spread extensively in the later dialects, as compared with the classical Syriac and Arabic. In Hebrew two conspicuous cases are exemplified by segolate nouns of the form גִּבּוֹר and by the perfect Piel of the verb. That words like קָרַן and גִּפְּן, were originally pronounced קָרִין and גִּפִּין, might be inferred from the Arabic forms قَرْنٌ and جَفْنٌ; it is rendered certain by the pausal forms קָרִין, גִּפִּין, and by the suffixed forms קָרַנִּי, גִּפְּנִי. Besides, we can cite the authority of the LXX., who write Ἀβελ for הֶבֶל, Γασίων Γαβέριον (1 Kings ix. 26) for עֲצִיּוֹן גִּבּוֹר, and the like. In many other words of the same class the root-vowel has been farther modified into *z*; as קָבַר, קָבַר, קָבַר, Arab. قَبِرَ; شָׁמֶשׁ, שָׁמֶשׁ, שָׁמֶשׁ, Arab. شَمَسَ. In all such words the vowel of the 2nd syllable is merely supplementary, and has nothing to do with the original form, but merely lightens the pronunciation of the two final consonants. Again, as to the verbal form Piel, that קָטַל stands for קָטַל is obvious from the following considerations.

(1) The Arabic form is قَتَلَ *kattala*, with a *fetha* in each syllable.

(2) The *ā* of the 1st syllable appears in the Aramaic ^{אֲ}עֲלֵא, and in Hebrew itself in the imperat. and imperfect קַטַּל and יִקְטַל.

(3) The *ā* of the 2nd syllable is seen in the 2nd pers. sing. קַטַּלְתָּ and analogous forms, as well as in numerous examples of the 3rd person, e.g. גִּדַּל, יָסַד, חִזַּק, בָּשַׁר, where the vocalisation depends partly upon the accentuation and partly upon other considerations. Sometimes the *ā* of the 2nd syllable is modified into *ɛ*, as in דָּבַר, כָּפַר, נָפַס; and this weakening, combined with the influence of the *ɛ* in the 1st syllable, has led to the form with *ɛ*, דִּבֵּר, גִּדֵּל. In the Hiphil, as we shall afterwards see, the process goes yet a step farther, *ā* being changed into *ī* by the successive steps *hak̄tal*, *hik̄tal*, *hik̄təl*, *hik̄tēl*, *hik̄tīl*.

On short *ɛ* we may content ourselves with noting that in Hebrew it is often modified in unaccented shut syllables into *ɛ̄* (ֵ), as עֲנֶלֶךְ, חָפְצִי; and that in western Syriac it usually appears as *ɛ̄* (ܐ), e.g. סִפְרוּ, סִפְרָה, סִפְרוּ for סִפְרוּ.

As for short *ɔ̄*, it chiefly appears in Hebrew in a shut syllable with dagesh forte, as עָזוּ, הָקִי, and the verbal form קָטַל. In an unaccented shut or half-shut syllable it generally becomes *ɔ̄*, as קָצַרְכֶּם, גָּדְלוּ (for קָדְשׁוּ, קָדְשֶׁהוּ); but also קָצַרְכֶּם, גָּדְלוּ. In Syriac this vowel is usually written *plene* with ܐ, as סִפְרוּ, but you must not therefore imagine it to be long in these and similar words.

An original short *ɔ̄* or *ɔ̄* has sometimes been modified in Hebrew into *ɛ̄*, which may appear in pausal forms as *ɛ̄*. This remark applies especially to the pronouns of the 2nd and 3rd pers. pl. and to the word אַתָּה. For instance, אַתֶּם stands for 'āntūm, as is shewn by the Arabic ^{أَنْتُمْ} and the Syriac ^{ܐܢܬܡ}. Similarly, the suffixes כֶּם and הֶם were originally *kūm* and *hūm*, as proved by the Arabic ^{كَمْ} and ^{هَمْ}, the latter of which becomes in certain cases هِم. The word אַתָּה stands for 'āth, as shewn by the

from יִרְדָּף; צַפְרִים from צַפֵּר; חֲצִי, with suffix חֲצִיו, in pause חֲצִי, for *hīṣṣī*. More rarely still a fuller vowel is employed, as in קִדְּשִׁים (also קִדְּשִׁים) from קִדֵּשׁ, שִׁרְשִׁים from שִׁרֵּשׁ, אֲהָלִים (and אֲהָרָה) from אָהֵל. I call your attention to these last forms in particular, as Delitzsch and Baer have recently sought to revive the erroneous pronunciation *kádáshīm* and *sháráshīm*.

The Aramaic, I may remark in passing, shares the tendency of the Hebrew to weaken or volatilize its short vowels, though it often proceeds by different rules. For instance, מְלִיכָא, מְלִיכָא, are weakened in exactly the same way as in Hebrew; but נַעֲמָן, נַעֲמָן, and עֲלֵהָב follow different rules from נִשְׁמָה and קִטְלוֹנִי.

The heightening or elevation of the three short vowels *ǎ ǣ ǝ* takes place in Hebrew, generally speaking, either in the tone-syllable of a word, or in the open syllable immediately preceding the tone. Short *ǎ* is heightened into *á*; short *ǣ* into *é*; and short *ǝ* or *ǖ* into *ó*. Bickell, following Olshausen, speaks of this heightening (§ 42, note 1) as being “merely a mechanical strengthening of the vowel through an *a*, which is placed before it, and which finds its complete analogy in the Indo-Germanic *guna* and the pronunciation of vowels in new high German and modern English¹.” I am not quite sure that I understand this explanation; but it is at all events clear that Olshausen² and Bickell regard the heightened vowels *á é ó* as arising by contraction from *ǎ + á*, *ǣ + í*, and *ǝ + ǝ*; and they believe this heightening to have been produced by the solemn reading or chanting of the Scriptures, and not to have existed in the language of ordinary life. As to the latter proposition, I myself believe that the slow and solemn recitation of the Scriptures in the synagogue has exercised a considerable effect upon the punctuation as exhibited to us in the Masoretic text of our Bible; but, on the other hand, I feel sure that even in the speech of everyday life such differences at least as exist between the pausal and the common forms of words must have been

¹ With this compare his explanatory observation at p. 140 [of the Eng. Tr.].

² [*Lehrb.* p. 110, § 57 a.]

more or less perceptible. The Egyptian fellâh says *mên hâda* ("who is this?"), but if you knock at his door, he calls out *mîn* ("who's there?"). You ask a shopkeeper *bi-kem er-raṭl*, "how much a pound?"; but if you use the first word only, you say *bi-kām* "how much?" If we consider, further, that the vowels *ī* and *ē*, *ō* and *ū*, frequently interchange in Hebrew, without our being able to assign any satisfactory reason; and that even in Arabic the sound of *kesr* is not, according to the best authorities, so sharp and distinct as that of our *ī* in *pin*, but rather inclines towards *ē*: we shall I think find little difficulty in believing that the heightened vowels *á* (◌◌◌◌), *é* (◌◌◌◌), *ó* (◌◌◌◌), may, as Noeldeke holds, have arisen in Hebrew from the short *ā* *i* *ū*, without the addition of any other element.

Of the three vowels, *ī* and *ū* are almost always heightened in the tone-syllable: as זָקֵן for *zākīn*, כֹּהֵן for *kāhīn*, יָדֵבֵר for *yūdābbēr*, סִפֵּר for *sīfr*: כָּל for *kūll*, יָקָם for *yākūm*, קָדַשׁ for *kūdsh*. But *ā* often remains in the tone-syllable; as in דָּבַר, מִשְׁפָּט; נָחַל, בֵּית, קָטַל. In fact, *á* chiefly appears in the closed tone-syllable of the absolute state of nouns, as in דָּבַר, מִשְׁפָּט; and in the open syllable before the tone, as in קָטַל, לָבַשׁ, קָטַן, דָּבַר. *ī* is also often heightened into *é* in the open syllable before the tone, as לָבַב for *libāb*, עָנַב for *ʿēnab*. The second syllable before the tone is less frequently heightened; as in קָטַל and קָטַל, וְקָטַל, הָעֵבֶרֶת (for הָעֵבֶרֶת), אֲהָלִים, etc.

It may have struck you as curious that, in many of the Hebrew words which I have lately cited, the short vowel *ō* and the heightened vowel *á* should be represented to the eye by the same sign ◌◌◌◌. This admits, however, of an easy explanation. Just as the pure *ā* of the Sanskrit is pronounced *ō* in Bengālī, so the heightened *á* of the Hebrew gradually passed in the mouths of many of the Jews (not of all) into *a*, and then into *o*. Consequently the punctuators were fairly justified, from a certain point of view, in representing it and *ō* by the same sign, even though there was a difference in the quantity of the two vowels. The same thing happened in the case of ◌◌◌◌, which represents

vowels of such different quantities as \bar{a} in גָּבַר and in יָנִיחַ. In the former instance, however, some confusion of sounds may actually arise. For instance, the plural of בֵּית is written בְּתִים, which must be read *bātīm*, and not *bottīm*, as is proved by Jewish tradition, by the accentuation, and by the evidence of the cognate Syriac form ܒܬܝܢ *bātīn*. If *bottīm* had been right, the Syriac form would certainly have been ܒܬܝܢ. Another example is afforded by רִנְיָהּ (Isaiah xxiv. 16), which, as I believe, is rightly read by Böttcher *rōzī-lī* (from a noun רִנְיָ), and not *rāzī-lī*.

In treating of this heightening of the vowels, I have taken no account of the Aramaic dialects, because in them it is neither so widely spread nor so readily perceived, owing to the defects of the vowel-system. I think, however, that the vowel of the tone-syllable in such verbal forms as נָפַח, נָבַח, נָלַח, נָפַח, must have differed in sound from that of the first syllable almost, if not quite, as much as in the Hebrew יָתֵן. As for *ó* in place of *ǎ*, it occurs, according to the eastern dialect of Syriac, in many verbal and nominal forms: for example, the imperfect and imperative ܢܚܬܐ *nĕḥtól* (*nĕḥtǔl*), ܚܬܐ *ḥtól*; and in the personal pronouns ܐܢܬܐ, ܐܢܬܐ, with the suffixes ܐܢܬܐ, ܐܢܬܐ, and the verbal form ܐܢܬܐ. In these latter cases, as we have seen above, the Hebrew has modified the original *ǎ* into *ǐ*, נָפַח, נָבַח, נָלַח, קָטַלְתָּם. The western Syrians weakened this *ó* again into *u*, saying ܢܚܬܐ, ܚܬܐ, but no doubt the quantity of this vowel much exceeded in length that of the original short *ǎ* in *nĕḥtǔl*.

I now proceed to speak briefly of the long vowels, *ā*, *ī*, *ū*.

Long *ā* has, we may say, almost disappeared from the Hebrew. Just as the long *ā* of the Sanskrit was modified in Greek into *η* and *ω*, so the long *ā* of the Arabic passed in Hebrew into *ā*. As *dadāmi* became *δίδομι*, or *āmas*, *ωμός*¹, so

¹ [The priority of *ā* in these cases is not now admitted.]

did *ḵātala* become קוֹטִיל (Poel); *ḵātīl^{um}*, קוֹטִיל (participle); חֶמָר, בְּתָב, etc. Exceptions to this rule are exceedingly rare. כְּתָב, can scarcely be reckoned a pure Hebrew word; and פֶּרֶת, is foreign to both languages [Assyrian *Purāt* (*Burat*), Accadian *Pura-nunu*, "the great river"]. מַעְרָה corresponds to the Arabic مَعَارَة, but the Syriac form has *pathach*, مَعْرَا, and not مَعْرَا. The most conspicuous of apparent exceptions is that which is presented to us by the perfect of verbs עָוַ, as נָצַר, נָצַר, corresponding to the Arabic بَانَ, قَامَ. Next are adjectives of the form קָטַל, like צִיר, טַבַּח, עוֹל, פֶּחֶשׁ, אֶבֶר, if they really correspond to such Arabic words as صَيَّاد, طَبَّاح, if they really correspond to such Arabic words as صَيَّاد, طَبَّاح, etc. This identification, however, is, as we shall afterwards see, somewhat doubtful; the Arabic forms just cited find their precise equivalents in such words as שָׂכָר = جَبَّار, גִּבּוֹר = (in sense סָכִיר), יָסוּר = قَتَّار - קָפוּז, and, with a rare retention of the original *pathach* in the first syllable, קָנָא = קָנֹא. The Aramaic vowel corresponding to the Arabic *ā* and Hebrew *ō* is the *zēḵāfā*, ܐ, pronounced by the eastern Syrians even at the present day *ā*, by the western *ā* or *ō*, whence the latter represent it in writing by the Greek *omikron*, ɔ. Compare with the above cited words the Syriac forms ܡܥܪܐ, ܡܥܪܐ, ܡܥܪܐ, ܡܥܪܐ (with dissimilation); ܡܥܪܐ, ܡܥܪܐ.

This vowel is sometimes weakened, both in Hebrew and Syriac, into *û*: e.g. קָשׁוּאִים, נְקוּמוֹת, נְקוּם, from a sing. קָשׁוּא, Arab. قَسَّاءٌ; Arab. قَتَّاعٌ, fem. مְתוּקָה, pl. مְתוּקִים; מְנוּם, מְנוּסִי, מְנוּן, מְנוּנִים, מְנוּנָה or מְנוּנָה, for מְנוּנָה, מְנוּנָה for מְנוּ, מְנוּ for מְנוּ. As a parallel I may mention

Syriac ܡܬܡܢ; and ܡܬܡܢܝ, with its construct plur. ܡܬܡܢܝܝ, may perhaps be only a variation upon ܡܬܡܢ, according to the form ܡܬܡܢܝܝܬ; but both words admit of other explanations. In Aramaic, however, a distinction of this sort existed, and actually forms one of the main distinctions in pronunciation between the eastern and western dialects of Syriac. The modern Syrians still retain *ō* in many forms where *ā* prevailed in the west. The vowel is represented by the letter ܐ: a point above this letter indicates the sound *ō*, beneath it the sound *ā*. The Western Syrians, who use the Greek vowels, write *au*, i.e. the Greek diphthong *ou*. Some of the principal forms in which the Eastern Syrians pronounced *ō* are the following: the pronominal forms ܐܬܐܢ, ܐܬܢܐ, ܐܬܢܐ, ܐܬܢܐ, ܐܬܢܐ, ܐܬܢܐ; the verbal forms ܐܬܢܐ, ܐܬܢܐ, ܐܬܢܐ; the nominal forms ܐܬܢܐ, ܐܬܢܐ; and the diminutive terminations ܐܬܢܐ and ܐܬܢܐ.

We next enter upon the examination of the so-called diphthongs *ay* (*ai*) and *aw* (*au*).

I have already told you that their sound has been weakened in Arabic to that of *ē* and *ō*. Compare in other languages *θαῦμα* and *θῶμα*, *παιδίον*, vulgar *παιδί*, *plaustrum* and *plostrum*, *causa* and *chose*; German *Auge* and Dutch *oog*, German *Stein* and Dutch *steen*; etc. In North Africa, however, a further weakening has taken place into *ī* and *ī̄*. Thus *يوم* *yawm* has gradually become first *yōm* and then *yūm*; *بيت* *bayt*, first *bēt* and then *bīt*.

Now mark the same progression in the other Semitic languages.

In Assyrian I find that our authorities write *āmu*, *bītu*, *ānu* (عين), *bīšu* (egg) without apparently the slightest trace of the older forms, which must necessarily have preceded them.

In Hebrew *ay* and *aw* are of somewhat rare occurrence in a perfectly pure form ; for example, שְׁלוֹתַי, צוֹ, קוֹ, מִיָּמִינִים, שֵׁי, גֵי.

עֹלָה, חֹרֶן (حوران); in the suffixed form דְּבָרִי; and when the letters ו and י are doubled, as בֶּן, דִּין ("cake"), or with suffixes גֹּדֶם, גֹּמֶם, חַי. More generally *ay* and *aw* are modified in various ways.

At the end of a word י= usually becomes ם or ן. We find סִנִּי, שָׂרִי, שָׂרִי, and the like; but far more frequently ם, as יְבִנָּה, שָׂרָה (in the construct state שָׂרָה), מְרָאָה, יְגִלָּה, imper. גִּלָּה. The intermediate step is marked by the pronunciation of the LXX., Σῠᾱ, Σᾱρα, corresponding to the Arabic termination *Minā, ramā*, which some pronounce with the 'imālah, *Minē, ramē*. In other cases, the *ā* element in the diphthong prevailed in Hebrew, and the termination became *ā*, ך, as in גִּלָּה. On these points I shall have more to say when I come to treat of the verbs לָה.

In the body of a word *ay* and *aw* exhibit several modifications. Sometimes a supplementary vowel is introduced, to lighten the pronunciation: as בֵּית for בִּית, מֶת for מִית. This latter form, in which the *ā* is heightened to *ā* is rare: אֶת, מֶת; but שָׂוָה, like גֵּיָה. The same supplementary vowel is found in the termination of the dual, יִם standing for יִם, Arabic *ayn*. At other times the *ā* sound in the diphthong predominates, yielding *ā* instead of *ay*. So מֶת, אֶת, מֶת, for מֶת, אֶת, מֶת, Arabic *bātim* for *bātim*, דֶּת for דֶּת, עֵינִים for עֵינִים; the suffixed form דְּבָרִי, also written דְּבָרִי, for דְּבָרִי. You will find a similar substitution of *ā* for *ai* in the older stages of our own language. The Gothic *ai* in *hails*, *hlais*, and *aigan*, became in Anglosaxon *hāl*, *hlāf*, and *āgan*, in English *whole*, *loaf* and *own*.

¹ If so, בֵּית follows the form of תֹּר, תֹּרִים; זֹת, זֹתִים; אֵל, אֵלִים; לֵל, לֵלִים; not that of שָׂוָה, שָׂוָה; עֵר, עֵרִים; פֵּשׁ, פֵּשִׁים; חֵל, חֵלִים; עֵן, עֵנִים. Nothke however pronounces the word *bātim*.

Generally speaking, however, *ay* and *aw* are modified as in vulgar Arabic into *ē* and *ō*, the *ē* being represented by ^ⲉ, and sometimes by ^ⲓ, the *ō* by ^ⲟ. So in ^{ⲁⲓ} for ^{ⲁⲓ} (with suffix, ^{ⲁⲓ}), ^{ⲁⲟ} for ^{ⲁⲟ} (^{ⲁⲟ}, ^{ⲁⲟ}); in segolate nouns ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, and in the construct state ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}; in the Niphal and Hiphil of verbs ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, as ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} for ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} for ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} for ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}; and in several forms of verbs ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, as ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} for ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} for ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} for ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}. This *ē* is frequently attenuated into *z*, and more rarely *ō* into *ū*. Thus ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} for ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, as in the vulgar Arabic of North Africa ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} *r'mīt* for *r'mēt* (*ramaita*). Perhaps also the proper name ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, instead of ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} (2 Sam. xiii. 20), if we regard it as a contemptuous diminutive, "that wretch of an Ammon." ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} would then stand for ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} i.e. *'umainān*, just as, in vulgar Arabic, *k'fifah* for *kufaifah*, as the diminutive of ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} *kuffah*, "a basket." As examples of *ō* becoming *ū*, I may mention ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} for ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, Arabic ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} for ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, imperf. of ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}; and ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, part. plur. Niphal of ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, for ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}. Here again we find a parallel in the vulgar Arabic forms of the imperfect of verbs ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, for ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}.

In Aramaic the position of matters is on the whole, *mutatis mutandis*, much the same as in Hebrew. In Syriac the original diphthongs appear, however, more frequently than in Hebrew; for example in the emphatic form of the segolates ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}; in the construct plural ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, where the Bibl. Aramaic, like the Hebrew, has ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}; in the plural suffixed forms ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} (Ch. ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}); in the Aphel of verbs ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, as ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}, ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} (Ch. ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}); and in such words as the diminutives ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} and ^{ⲙⲟⲩ} (Ch. ^{ⲙⲟⲩ}).

At the end of a word we find forms similar to those of the Hebrew; e.g. with \bar{e} , ܠܝܠܝܐ , ܠܝܠܝܐ , ܠܝܠܝܐ ; with \bar{a} , ܠܝܠܝܐ .

In the body of a word, Syriac ay sometimes becomes \bar{e} , as in the construct ܠܝܠܝܐ , and in the duals ܠܝܠܝܐ , ܠܝܠܝܐ ; in Biblical Aramaic ܠܝܠܝܐ , but ܠܝܠܝܐ .

The \bar{a} -sound predominates, for example, in Targumic ܠܝܠܝܐ (200) and ܠܝܠܝܐ [80, for ܠܝܠܝܐ , as well as ܠܝܠܝܐ]; in the plural ܠܝܠܝܐ ; in the adverb ܠܝܠܝܐ , pronounced *ākḥ* (Ch. ܠܝܠܝܐ); in the plural suffixed forms of the Jewish Aramaic ܠܝܠܝܐ or ܠܝܠܝܐ , "thy servants," [Targumic] ܠܝܠܝܐ or [Biblical] ܠܝܠܝܐ [*kṣrī*] "her servants," ܠܝܠܝܐ "our servants," as contrasted with ܠܝܠܝܐ and ܠܝܠܝܐ .

Further, \bar{e} sinks into \bar{i} , according to the western pronunciation, in the simple forms of the segolates ܠܝܠܝܐ ; also in the forms ܠܝܠܝܐ (construct), ܠܝܠܝܐ , ܠܝܠܝܐ ; in many forms of the 1st and 2nd pers. in the perf. of verbs ܠܝܠܝܐ , as perf. Peal ܠܝܠܝܐ (but Nestorian ܠܝܠܝܐ), Paal ܠܝܠܝܐ and ܠܝܠܝܐ , etc. Similarly, \bar{o} sinks into \bar{u} , in ܠܝܠܝܐ "if" (= ܠܝܠܝܐ + ܠܝܠܝܐ); and, at least according to the western pronunciation, in the simple state of the segolates ܠܝܠܝܐ , ܠܝܠܝܐ ("end").

In the later Aramaic dialects there is a strong tendency to get rid of the diphthongs. Already in old Syriac we find ܠܝܠܝܐ *ākḥ*, with short \bar{a} , for ܠܝܠܝܐ ; ܠܝܠܝܐ *lilyā*, for *lilyā*, *lailyā* (ܠܝܠܝܐ); and another example of the same kind is ܠܝܠܝܐ (for ܠܝܠܝܐ); but the modern Syrian says *līt* for ܠܝܠܝܐ ; *ikā* or *ikā* (ܠܝܠܝܐ) for ܠܝܠܝܐ ; *idh* (ܠܝܠܝܐ) for ܠܝܠܝܐ and ܠܝܠܝܐ and ܠܝܠܝܐ and ܠܝܠܝܐ ; *bāthwā* (*th*), "houses," ܠܝܠܝܐ "our houses"; and even *tyčḥwā*

for **חֶפְצָא**. So also, though to a less extent, in Mandaitic, where we find **לִית** as well as **לֵאִית** (**לִית**), and **קִרִית** for **קִרְתָּ** as well as **קִרְתָּ**.

I will now say a few words on the different classes of supplementary vowels, especially in Hebrew. These, as is indicated by the term which I have just employed, do not belong to the original vocalisation of the word, but have been introduced at subsequent periods, to make the pronunciation of it easier by facilitating the utterance of a harsh consonant or of a combination of consonants.

(1) The so-called *furtive pathach*, which is inserted between a long or heightened vowel and the final gutturals **ע** **ה** **ה**; as **אֱלֹהִים** for *elōh*, Aram. **אֱלֹהָא**, **אֱלֹהִים**, Arab. **إِلَهِ**, **إِلَهِ** for *zērō*, Aram. **זֵרְעָא**, **זֵרְעָא**, Arab. **زِرَاع**; **תַּפְּלִיחַ** for *tappūh*, Arab. **تَفْلَح**; **רוּחַ** for *rūh*, **רוּחַ**, **רוּחַ**; **מִשְׁלַחַ** for *mēshallāh*, i.e. *mushallīh*; **רֵעַ** for *rē*, *rē*. This sound is heard in the spoken Arabic of the present day, in such words as **صَاحِبِ**, **رِيح**, **رِيح**, **مَمْفُوح** **مَمْفُوح**, **سُطُوح** **سُطُوح**, but it is not, and never has been, written in this language or in Syriac, where we find only **لִפְתָּחַ** and the like.

(2) The auxiliary *pathach* which is sometimes inserted between **ע** or **ה** and **ד** or **ת** at the end of a word. It is so slight in sound as not even to effect the aspiration of the **ד** or **ת**. For example: **שְׁמַעַתְ**, **שְׁמַעַתְ**, **הַמְלַחַתְ**, **לִקְחַתְ**, **שְׁבַחַתְ**, as well as **יִרְדְּ**, **יִרְדְּ**, **יִפַּתְ**, **יִפַּתְ**, as compared with **יִרְדְּ** for **יִרְדְּ**.

(3) The auxiliary vowel **ֵ**, **ֶ**, **ֶ**, in various nominal and verbal forms, which is very little stronger than no. 2. For example, in segolate nouns: **נָעַר**, **תַּחַתְ**, **יֶלֶדְ**, **זֶרַעְ**, **פָּרָאְ**, **סִפָּרְ**, **קָדַשְׁ**, **פָּעַלְ**, **מָוֶתְ**, **בֵּיתְ**, and in the dual termination **יִם**. The auxiliary is actually wanting in such words as **נָרַדְ**, **קִשְׁטְ**.

(also קִשַּׁט, חָטָא, גִּיָּא, שָׁנָא. And again, in the shortened imperfect or jussive of verbs לִיבָּהּ, וִירָבָה, וִיגַל, וְיִתְכַל, וְיִתְעַשׂ, וְיִבְדֵּךְ, וְיִשְׁט, וְיִשְׁתֵּךְ, וְיִרְדֵּךְ, וְיִפְתֵּךְ; contrasted with יָרַע, יָרָא, וְיִשְׁק, וְיִשְׁב, וְיִרָא, where perhaps the final *shēvā* may have once been slightly moveable, *wayyiftā*, *we-yērdā*, etc. A somewhat similar insertion of a short *ā* takes place in Mandaitic in the word אֵיךְ for אֵי, and in the plural suffix of the 1st pers. אֵינָא for אֵי, as כַּאֲפֵאֵינָא *our hands*, עֲדֵאֵינָא *our hands*. Perhaps also in the pronoun of the 2nd pers. masc. אֲנָתוֹן, אֲנָת. The vulgar Arabic has this auxiliary vowel, for example, in the segolates, صَبَحَ, *subḥ*, رَمَحَ, *rumḥ*, سَطَحَ, *saṭḥ*, نَسَخَ, *nāsakh*, نَفَخَ, *nafakh*.

(4) A guttural letter at the end of a toneless syllable often takes a very short vowel, when an ordinary consonant would remain vowelless. This vowel, which is represented in writing by a *compound shēvā*, conforms in character to the preceding vowel. Thus: יַחֲזֹק and יַעֲמֹד, for יַחֲזֹק and יַעֲמֹד, of the form יַחֲזֹק and יַחֲזֹק, for יַחֲזֹק and יַחֲזֹק, of the forms יַחֲזֹק and יַחֲזֹק, for יַחֲזֹק and יַחֲזֹק, of the forms יַחֲזֹק and יַחֲזֹק, for יַחֲזֹק and יַחֲזֹק, of the forms יַחֲזֹק and יַחֲזֹק. Examples to the contrary are: אַחֲפֹד, יַאֲשֹם, יַאֲסֹר and אַחֲפֹד, יַחֲשֹב, יַחֲשֹן, יַחֲשֹן, יַחֲשֹן, יַחֲשֹן, יַחֲשֹן.

(5) The compound *shēvā* spoken of under no. 4 frequently becomes a *full short vowel*, when the guttural is followed by a consonant with the shortest vowel (*shēvā mobile*). Thus

with	יַעֲמֹד	compare	יַעֲמֹד	for	יַעֲמֹד
"	יַחֲזֹק	"	יַחֲזֹק	"	יַחֲזֹק
"	יַאֲסֹף	"	יַאֲסֹף	"	יַאֲסֹף
"	נַאֲסֹף	"	נַאֲסֹף	"	נַאֲסֹף
"	נַעֲרוֹ	"	נַעֲרוֹ	"	נַעֲרוֹ
"	פַּעֲלוֹ	"	פַּעֲלוֹ	"	פַּעֲלוֹ

but on the contrary observe such forms as מַחֲשֹבֹתִי, וַחֲלֹקִי.

Of this supplementary vowel a far wider use is made in Aramaic. Thus in the Targums we find מְרִינְחָא for מְרִינְחָא, מְשִׁרְיִיתָא for מְשִׁרְיִיתָא; whilst in Syriac we may say מְרִינְחָא, מְשִׁרְיִיתָא, מְרִינְחָא, and מְשִׁרְיִיתָא, for מְרִינְחָא, מְשִׁרְיִיתָא, מְרִינְחָא, and מְשִׁרְיִיתָא; מְרִינְחָא, and מְשִׁרְיִיתָא, for מְרִינְחָא, and מְשִׁרְיִיתָא. In Mandaitic this insertion is very general, the vowel *u* being also occasionally employed, as הוֹכּוּמְתָא and הוֹכּוּמְתָא (הוֹכּוּמְתָא, הוֹכּוּמְתָא); in the conjugation Ethpe'el, the normal form is עֲתִינְסִיב = ʔַעֲתִינְסִיב.

(6) Here, too, may find its place the *prosthetic vowel*, which is prefixed to a word to facilitate the pronunciation of an initial consonant which has weakened or lost its original vowel. Compare in Greek *χθές* and *ἐχθές*, *ἀσπαίρω* and *σπαίρω*; Spanish *escudo*, *escuela*; French *espère*, *esprit*; Italian *con isciienza*, in *Ispagna*. In ancient Arabic this vowel is usually *ʾ* or *h*, as in the imperative أَفْرِقْ, أَجْلِسْ, أَقْتُلْ; in the verbal conjugations أَفْتَلَّ, أَفْتَلَّ, and أَفْتَلَّ; in ابْنٌ (for بَنِي), *son*, اِثْنَانٌ, *two*, اِسْمٌ or اِسْمٌ, *name*, etc. In the vulgar dialects examples are far more numerous: e.g. اِتَّقَاتْلْ and اِتَّقَاتْلْ, for تَقَاتْلْ and تَقَاتْلْ, اِمْبَارَكْ for مَبَارَكْ, etc. In Hebrew we find אֶ, אֶ, as in אֶזְרִיעַ for זְרִיעַ, אֶזְעָדָה for זְעָדָה, and perhaps a few more, such as אֶתְמֹל and אֶתְמֹל, אֶתְנִן, אֶשְׁפָּר “measure.” In שְׁתִּים the prosthetic אֶ, though pronounced by many of the Jews, has not been written. In Aramaic occur both אֶ and אֶ. Already in Biblical Aramaic we have אֶרְכָּבָה “knee,” in the Palestinian dialect אֶרְכָּבָה. In Syriac we find אֶרְכָּבָה for אֶרְכָּבָה, אֶרְכָּבָה for

ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ, ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ and ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ, for ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ, ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ, ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ for ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ "street," ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ and ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ for ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ and ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ, ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ for ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ or ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ, etc.

In ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ the prosthetic vowel has been influenced by the original vowel of the ⲓ, as shewn in the Arabic رِقْعَة. In the later dialects of Aramaic, examples of the prosthetic vowels become more and more numerous.

(7) Different from this vowel is the likewise very short vowel which is occasionally prefixed in Hebrew and Aramaic to words beginning with a consonant and a full vowel. This addition may sometimes find its explanation in the harshness of the initial consonant, as when it is ק, ט, or even ר; but in other cases even this reason is wanting. Examples in Hebrew are:

ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ "melons" (ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ, ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ), ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ "blains" or "small

blisters" (ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ "bubbles" of water), ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ "wings" of an

army, ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ "fetters," ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ probably the same as *κάρταλος*, *κάρταλλος*, which is also found in Arabic and Syriac: ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ

a Persian coin, called by the Greeks *δαρεικός*¹: ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ "a nut,"

Arab. جوز, Syr. ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ, probably from the Persian گوز *gōz*: in Syriac

ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ for ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ (Pers. راز), where the ⲓ was doubtless once sounded, *ārāzā*; in later dialects ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ for ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ "blood," ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ "leaf," for

ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ; Mand. עשומיא for שומיא "heaven," ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ for

ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ "heights," ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ "wool," ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ "dust," for the

older ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ and ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ.

This concludes what I have to say for the present upon the consonants and vowels of the languages with which we are dealing—Arabic, Hebrew and Syriac. I now proceed to treat of the different parts of speech, beginning with the pronouns.

¹ [In a Phoenician inscription of 96 B.C., recently found at the Piræus, ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ and ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲓ seem to stand for *δραχμα*.]

CHAPTER VI.

THE PRONOUNS.

HERE let me call your attention, in the first place, to certain elements which enter into the formation of a great many of the pronouns, as well as of the demonstrative and other particles, of the Semitic languages. I can give these elements no better general or common name than that of *demonstrative* letters or syllables. Their origin and precise original force are in most cases unknown to me; or, at all events, I can only make such guesses at them as it is hardly worth while to lay before you just now, when you have need rather of facts than of speculations. The principal of these demonstrative letters, so far as regards the pronouns, are: א and ה, ד and ת, ש, כ, ל, נ, מ, י and י. We shall notice each of them more particularly as occasion requires in our survey of the pronouns.

A. *The Personal Pronouns.*

In treating of the personal pronouns I shall begin, for reasons which will afterwards become apparent, with the suffixed forms which we find appended to substantives in the singular.

Of the 1st pers. sing. the fullest form in actual use is the Arabic *يَ* *ya*, which is usually shortened, according to circumstances, into *ي* *ya* or *يَ* *z̄*, as *قَعَايَ*, *نَفْسِي*, *نَفْسِي*. It is obviously identical with the Ethiopic *ρ*: *ya*, in *ሰፍሰሰ*: *nafs'ya*; and with the Assyrian *ya*, in *bīl-ya* "my house." This latter,

I am told, becomes *ī* and in certain cases *a*, as *bintī* "my daughter," *abūa* (for *abūya*), as well as *abī* and even *aba*, "my father"; with which last compare such Arabic forms as ^{يَا بَنِي} *yā bna* 'amma, ^{يَا رَبَّ} *yā rabbā*. The Hebrew form is, as you all know, אֲבִי, of which the *yūd*, though written, is no longer pronounced in Syriac: ^{ܡܠܕܝܬܐ} *ܡܠܕܝܬܐ*. The intermediate step, no doubt, was the shortening of *ī* into *ĭ*, which we find sometimes in old Arabic, especially in vocative forms like ^{يَا رَبَّ} *yā rabb*, which in pause would be pronounced ^{يَا رَبَّ} *yā rabb*. The corresponding plural is in Arab. ^{نَا} *nā*, sometimes shortened into *nā*; in Eth. ነ፡ *nā*, in Assyrian *nī* or *nū*, Heb. נִי, Aram. ܢܝ, Syr. ^{ܡܠܕܝܬܐ} *n*, as ^{ܡܠܕܝܬܐ} *ܡܠܕܝܬܐ*. These plural forms serve also to designate the accusative after a verb, and we have here evidently the same *n* that appears in the suffix of the accusative sing., viz. Arab. ^{نِي} *niya* or *nī*, Eth. ነ፡ *nī*, Assyrian *nī*, Heb. נִי, Aram. ܢܝ, Syr. ܢܝ *n* (the *yūd* being suppressed).

In the 2nd person we find a necessary distinction of gender introduced by the differentiation of the final vowel; the masc. form was originally, as in Arabic, ^{كَ} *kā*, the fem. ^{كِ} *kī*. Identical with these are the Ethiopic ነ፡ *ka*, ነ፡ *kī*, and the Assyrian *ka*, *kī*. The corresponding Hebrew forms are קָ and קִי, the latter generally abbreviated into קִ. The Aramaic forms are ^{ܩܐ} *qā* for the masc. and ^{ܩܝ} *qā* for the fem., but the *yūd* has become silent, ^{ܩܐܝܬܐ} *ܩܐܝܬܐ*; so that these forms are identical with those of the vulgar Arabic, masc. ^{اكَ} *ak*, or *k*, fem. *ek* or *kī*. The plurals were originally, as in Arabic, masc. ^{كُم} *kumū*, shortened into *kum*, fem. *kunna*; Ethiopic ነ፡ *kēmū* and ነ፡ *kēn*; Assyrian *kumu* or *kun*, of which the fem., according to analogy, should be *kina* or *kin*. The Hebrew forms are

כֶּם for *kēm*, fem. כֶּן, but for the latter the fuller כְּנָה or כִּנָּה sometimes occurs. The Aramaic forms are כֶּן, fem. כֶּס, but כֶּם is also found in Biblical Aramaic (Ezra).

In the 3rd person we have again a variation of vowels according to gender. The Arabic forms are, masc. هـ *hu* (with long vowel, though written defectively), which becomes هـ *hi* when preceded by an *i*, as *abū-hu*, *abī-hi*; fem. هـ. The corresponding forms in Ethiopic are ሁ: *hū*, ህ: *hā*. In Hebrew the masc. is הוּ, but also הוֹ, הִי, which is nearly identical with the vulgar Arabic هـ, pronounced *u* or *o*, as in كِتَابُهُ, also written كِتَابُو. The Hebrew fem. is הִי and הֵי. In Aramaic the masc. is הוּ, fem. הִי. The corresponding plurals in Arabic are, masc. هُمْ *humū*, generally abbreviated *hum*, which may be changed by the influence of a preceding *i* into *himū* or *himī* and *him*; the fem. is هُنَّ *hunna* or *hinna*. The Ethiopic has ሁዎ: *hōmū* and ህዎ: *hōn*. The Hebrew forms are, masc. הֵם and הֵם, or, with final vowel, הֵם; fem. הֵן (rarely הֵן) and הֵן, or, with final vowel, הֵן, הֵן, הֵן. In Aramaic we find הוּן, הֵן and הֵן, but in the Aramaic of Ezra also הֵם. In contrast with these stand the Assyrian suffixes with initial š; sing. masc. šu, fem. ša, plur. masc. šunu or šun, fem. šina or šin. A similar form is found in one of the Himyaritic dialects, where the sing. masc. is written ሙ or ሙ, pl. ሙ, whereas in the other we find ሙ and ሙ; and traces of it exist in the modern Mehri, in which according to Maltzan, the sing. masc. is *he*, fem. *es*, plur. masc. *hum*, fem. *senn*.

From a comparison of these various forms we may fairly assume the oldest shape of the suffixed pronouns actually known to us to be:

1st sing.	<i>iya</i>	plur.	<i>nā</i>	dual (only in Arabic)
2nd	„ m. <i>ka</i>	„ m.	<i>kumū</i>	} <i>kumā</i>
	„ f. <i>ki</i>	„ f.	<i>kunna</i>	
3rd	„ m. <i>sū, hū</i>	„ m.	<i>sīnu, humū</i>	} <i>humā</i>
	„ f. <i>sā, hā</i>	„ f.	<i>sīna, hunna</i>	

I have put *sū* and *hū* together in order to lay before you two alternatives; viz. (1) *hū* may be identical with *sū*, initial *s* having passed into *h*, just as in Sanskrit compared with Persian, or Greek compared with Latin; or (2) *sū* and *hū* may spring from different demonstrative letters *s* and *h*, a point to which we shall have to recur hereafter.

From these suffixed pronouns *iya*, *ka* and *hū*, we obtain, by prefixing the demonstrative syllable *an* (אן), the three pronouns *aniya*, *anka* and *anhū*. The syllable *an*,—itself a compound of א and נ,—we may regard as a sort of demonstrative particle or interjection, akin probably to the Arabic ^{هـ}ان. ^{هـ}ان. Hebrew הן, הנה, Syriac ܐܢܝܐ, and Ethiopic እን: in እንክሙ: *en'kēmū*, “en vobis = accipite.”

The third of these pronouns, *anhū*, appears but rarely as an independent word. I would instance the Talmudic איהו, fem. איהי, possibly assimilated from אינהו, אינהי, with the first vowel weakened from *a* to *i*. At any rate, the plural forms, which are without assimilation, are אינהו, אינהי, for אינהון, אינהין. In Syriac too we find ܐܢܗܘ, ܐܢܗܝ, assimilated for ܐܢܫܘܐ, ܐܢܫܝܐ. Otherwise these forms are used as suffixes; for example, in Hebrew, נהו, as יברכנהו, assimilated ננו, fem. ננה; and also in the later Aramaic dialects, as Mand. ינהון or ינן, fem. ינהין, ינין; Talm. ינהו, ינהי.

The same is the case with the second of the above pronouns, *anka*, which appears in Hebrew only as a suffix, e.g. אתקנה (from נתק, Jerem. xxii. 24), usually with assimilation נתן; in Mand. ינכון, fem. ינכין.

The first of these three forms, *aniya*, is found, however, with slight modifications in most of the Semitic languages. What its

origin may be, I can hardly pretend to explain, unless we connect it with a demonstrative root *i*, "this," also found in the Indo-European languages, in which case *an-īya* would literally mean *behold this one* or *this one here*, as a designation of the speaker. This would still, however, leave the final element *ya* or *a* unaccounted for.

In Hebrew the form *aniya* appears almost intact in אֲנִי, in pause, with fuller vowel, אֲנִי. In the other languages the older form is more or less obscured: Arabic, أَنا *ānā*, with short *a* in both syllables, dialectically *ānā*, in pause *ānā* and *ānāh*; Ethiopic likewise አኅ: *ānā*; J. Aram. אָנָּא (אָנָּא Bibl.) or אָנָּא, Syriac ܐܢܐ *ēnā* or *ēnō*. Similarly in the younger dialects: Tigré አኅ: *anā*, Tigrīña አኅ: *anē* or አኅ: *anā*, Amharic አኅ: *ēnē*; Mand. אָנָּא, modern Syriac ܐܢܐ. As the proper plural of אֲנִי we may regard אֲנֵנו (Jerem. xlii. 6, *kēthīb*h), to which, among the later dialects, the Amharic offers a parallel in the form *ēñā*. I may add that in Arabic, Ethiopic and Syriac this pronoun is liable to considerable mutilation. In Arabic we find أَن *an*, and likewise in Ethiopic, when followed by the particle ሰ: *sa*, አኅ: *an-sa*. In Syriac the first syllable is liable to be elided under certain circumstances, whence arise such forms as ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ, and finally, dropping the last vowel, ܐܢܐ. Hence in modern Syriac the verbal form of the present, 1st pers. sing. ܐܢܐ *I end*, ܐܢܐ *I repair*.

There is, however, another form of the pronoun of the 1st pers. sing., which we must endeavour to explain, namely that which is found in Assyrian, Hebrew and Phoenician. Here the first demonstrative basis, *an*, has been strengthened by the addition of a second, *ak* or *āk*, which I take to be compounded of א and כ, and to be akin to such words as כָּא, כָּא, "here," כָּא "thus, here, now," כֵּי "that," כָּא "here," אֵכָא "how," etc. As the oldest form I venture to write *anākīya* or *anākī*, whence

in Assyrian *anāku* (Haupt, *anākū*), in which the 2nd syllable must surely be long, as the corresponding Hebrew form is אָנֹכִי, in pause אָנֹכִי. The Hebrew has preserved the vowel of the last syllable in a purer state than the Assyrian. On the Moabite stone it appears as אַנְךְ, probably pronounced *anōkh*; whilst in Phoenician inscriptions we also find אַנְךְ, which in the ears of Plautus sounded like *anēch*. I may remind you in passing that the Egyptian pronoun was also *anek*, *cnek*, and the Coptic אኖκ. The form *āku*, without the prefix *an*, is employed in Assyrian as an enclitic with the force of the substantive verb, e.g. *sarrāku* "I am king," *rabbāku* "I am great," *zīkarāku* "I am manly"; thus corresponding to the use of אָנֹכִי for אָנִי in Syriac.

The corresponding plural form is still more remarkable: Assyrian *anīni*, *nīni*, *nīnu* for *anīhni*, *anaḥni*, Heb. אֲנִי־הֵנוּ, Phoen. אַנְחֵנוּ. Here then ה of the singular has interchanged with ח (as in שָׁחַד, מַשְׁבֵּחַ, compared with שָׁכַד, מַשְׁבַּח compared with אֲבֹטִיחִים), and the vowel has been shortened in the shut syllable. The last syllable of the word, נוּ, is probably shortened from אָנוּ, the plural form of אָנִי, which we mentioned above. This plural אַנְחֵנוּ, abbreviated in Hebrew itself into אֲנִי־הֵנוּ, is found, in some shape or other, in nearly all the Semitic dialects. Arabic: نَكْنُ, vulgar نَكْنِ *nehne*, *nehn*, أَحْنَا *aḥnā* in Egypt *iḥna*. Ethiopic: ነክነ: *nehna*, Tigré *nahna*, Tigrīna *nehnā*. Syriac, with an additional demonstrative *n* at the end, أَنْسِنֵ, commonly سِنֵ, which is shortened in pronunciation into *nan*, as in أَفْكِنֵ سِنֵ. Also أَنْسِنֵ, with prosthetic vowel, whence in modern Syriac إِنْسِنֵ and إِنْسَب, but also *ākhnōkhun*, إِنْسَهَجَف (with a curious assimilation to the pronoun of the 2nd pers. *ākhtōkhun*, إِنْسَهَجَف). In Samaritan we also find the form אַנְחֵנוּ, whilst in the Palestinian dialect of Syriac, אַנְס,

and in the modern Syriac of Ma'lûla, ܐܢܝ *anāh*, the final *n* has vanished. Jewish Aramaic forms are ܐܢܝܢ and ܢܝܢ; but in several dialects the guttural has been elided, whence in the Talmud ܐܢ, in Samaritan ܐܢ, in Mandaitic ܐܢܝܢ (*anēn* for *anān*), and in Palestinian Syriac ܐܢܝ and more commonly ܐܢܝ. Likewise in Assyrian, as above mentioned, *anāni*, *nāni* or *nānu*.

On reviewing what I have said about the pronoun of the 1st pers. sing., you may think that much of it is very precarious and doubtful; in particular that the derivations which I have ventured to suggest of the forms ܐܢܝ and ܢܝܢ are very far-fetched; that ܐܢܝ can hardly be compounded with a demonstrative particle or interjection, '+(ܢ+ܐ), and ܢܝܢ with two words of that class '+(ܢ+ܐ)+(ܢ+ܐ). In reply I can only point to the history of the pronominal forms in other languages, for instance the Romance. Whence comes the French *ce*? In some cases it appears in the modern language as *cet*, for which the older form is *cest*. But *cest* is identical with the Italian *questo*, which springs from *eccu isto*, i.e. *eccum istum*, i.e. *ecce eum istum*! Even the English *I* is but the last remnant of *ich* or *ik*, *ego*, ἐγώ, ἐγών, Sanskrit *aham*, all pointing to an original *agham* or *agam*, which has been supposed to be made up of three elements, *a* + *gha* (or *ga*) + *m*, the first of which is either the demonstrative root *a* "this," or else a mutilation of *ma*; whilst the second is a particle, identical with the Greek γε, and the third, in all probability, another demonstrative letter.

I pass on to the pronoun of the 2nd person in its independent form. Here the demonstrative syllable *an* is prefixed, not to the syllable *ka*, but to *ta*. Both these syllables are, it seems likely, also of a demonstrative character, and admit of being explained in one of two ways. Either (1) *ka* is a mere variety of *ta* (compare τίς τί with Sanskrit *nā-ki-s* "nemo," *ki-m* "what?" *quis*, *quid*); or (2) they spring from different demonstrative letters, *k* and *t*. The one of these we have already mentioned as lying at the root of ܐܠ, ܢܐ, ܕܐ, and similar words; whilst the other gives birth to various forms, of some of which we shall have to treat presently. If so, the pronoun of the 2nd person designates the individual spoken

to as a "this" or "here," in contradistinction to the more remote "that" or "there" of the 3rd person. In the Indo-European languages the same element seems to lie at the root of both pronouns, for Sanskrit *tvaṃ*, i.e. *tu-am*, "thou," differs only in its vowel from *ta*, the base of the demonstrative pronoun *tat*, in Greek *τό*.

The oldest form of this pronoun known to us in Semitic is the Arabic ^{أَنْتَ} *anta*, with its fem. ^{أَنْتِ} *anti*, dual ^{أَنْتُمَا} *antuma*, plur. masc. ^{أَنْتُمْ} *antumū*, shortened *antum*, and fem. ^{أَنْتُنَّ} *antunna*. The dual is found in Arabic only, and has disappeared from its vulgar dialects, in which the forms in use are *enta* or *ent* (Egypt. *intc*), *enti* or *entī* (Egypt. *inty*, *enty*), *entum* or *entū* (Egypt. *intū*). Almost identical with these are the Ethiopic ለአተ: *anta*, *antī*, *antēmū*, *antēn*, which appear in Tigré as *anta*, *antī*, *antūm*, and in Amharic as *anta*, *antyi* or *anty*, plur. *antū*. But in Tigrīña they have been displaced by the compound ንክክ: *něss'khā*, fem. *něss'khī*, plur. *něss'atkūm*, *něss'atkēn*, by assimilation for *něfs'khā*, etc.

In Assyrian and Hebrew *nt* have been assimilated into *tt*. The Assyrian forms are *attā*, *attī*, plur. masc. *attūnu*, (fem., according to analogy, *attīna*). In Hebrew the masc. sing. is אַתָּה, in pause אַתָּה or אַתָּה; but the shorter אַת, *attē* or *att*, also occurs, Num. xi. 15; Deut. v. 24, and in some other passages in the Kēthībh, e.g. Ps. vi. 4; Job i. 10; Eccles. vii. 22. Its fem. is אַתִּי, which occurs sometimes in the Kēthībh, viz. Judges xvii. 2; 1 Kings xiv. 2; 2 Kings iv. 16, 23, and viii. 1; Jerem. iv. 30; Ezek. xxxvi. 13; but it has been almost supplanted by the shorter אַת, *attē* or *att*, in pause אַת. The plur. masc. is אַתֶּם, with *ē* for *ū*; the fem. is אַתֶּנָּה, sometimes written אַתְּנָה and אַתְּנָה; but the shorter אַתֶּן or אַתֶּן is found in Ezek. xxxiv. 31, and with assimilation of the *n* to a following *m*, in Ezek. xiii. 20, אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם מְצַדְּרֹת (observe Ezek. xxxiii. 26, עֲשִׂיתֶן תּוֹעֵבָה for עֲשִׂיתֶם, and Isaiah xxxv. 1, יִשְׁעוֹם מְדַבֵּר for יִשְׁשׁוֹן).

In Biblical Aramaic and the Targūms we find both the primitive and the assimilated forms, אַנְתָּה, אַנְתָּ, אַתָּ, fem. אַתָּ, plur. masc. אַנְתּוֹן, אַתּוֹן, fem. אַנְתִּין, אַתִּין. In Syriac the *n*, though written, is never pronounced, and the final *t* of the fem. sing. has also been dropped, אַתָּ, אַתָּ, אַתָּ, אַתָּ. The forms of the later dialects are in some cases such as we should naturally expect; e.g. Samaritan אַתָּה or אַתָּ, fem. אַתִּי, plur. אַתּוֹן, אַתּוֹן; Palestinian Syriac, אַתָּ, fem. אַתָּ, plur. אַתָּ and אַתָּ, אַתָּ. But in others there are points worthy of remark. For instance, in Mandaitic, instead of *n* and *t* being assimilated, a short *ā* is inserted between them, אַנְאָת, plur. אַנְאָתוֹן. Again, in the vulgar Syriac of Ma'lūla, we find אַח ach or אַח hach, with the plur. אַחְכֻּן achkhun or אַחְכֻּן hachun, where *t* has been softened into *ty*, *ch*, as in مَدِينَتَا (مدینچا), كَاجِبَا (كاجچا), دَارچَا (دارچا). The modern Nestorian or eastern forms are אַתָּ at or אַתִּין attin, the latter with a curious appendage; and not less strange are the plurals אַתָּ and אַתָּ, which can only be explained as having arisen under the influence of the 1st pers. אַנְבִּי or אַנְבִּי, whilst conversely the form of the 1st person אַנְבִּי must have owed its birth to this falsely formed אַתָּ.

The separate pronouns of the 1st and 2nd persons have, as we have seen, received a demonstrative increment at the beginning; with the pronoun of the 3rd pers. the reverse apparently is the case. The Assyrian šū, fem. šī, and the corresponding Syriac אַתָּ, fem. אַתָּ, may perhaps never have had any such increment; but it is, I think, otherwise with the Hebrew and Arabic singulars. In Hebrew these forms, with the ancient and necessary difference of vowels, are אַתָּ, fem. אַתָּ. Now some scholars believe that the *aleph* is a mere orthographic sign, like the Arabic *elif* in the 3rd pers. plur.

of the verb, **قَتَلُوا**, which is occasionally found even in Hebrew (**הִרְלִכּוּ** Josh. x. 24; **אָבוּא** Isaiah xxviii. 12). In this view I can hardly concur, because the words are written with this *aleph* in the oldest documents we possess, such as the Moabite stone (masc. **וְיֹאמֶר גַּם הָא**) and the sarcophagus of Eshmūn'āzār, king of Sidon (masc. **אָדָם הָא** "that man," fem. **הַמַּמְלָכָה הָא** "this kingdom"). Had the original sounds been merely *hū* and *hī*, we should have found on such monuments **הוּ** and **הי**. I conclude, therefore, that the words must have sounded originally something like *hū-a* and *hī-a*, with the addition of a demonstrative *a* at the end. This will seem less improbable to you, when you are told that the modern Syrian forms from **וָא** *ō* and **וָא** *ē*, by the addition of **וְאֵ**, another demonstrative **וְאֵ וָא** (**וְאֵ וָא**) *ē'ā*, "that," "yonder." That Plautus heard the Phoenician word pronounced as *hy* only proves that the Carthaginians, like the Jews, had gradually let this additional sound drop, although they retained the symbol of it in writing.

I have said nothing to you as yet of the use of **הוּא** for the fem. gender in Hebrew, because I do not believe in its existence. The distinction of the vowels in **הוּא** and **היא**, *sū* and *sī*, is just as primitive and essential as in *anta*, *anti* and *ka*, *ki*. I am aware that **הוּא** takes the place of **היא** in various passages of the Pentateuch; but in old Hebrew MSS. **ו** and **י** are very much alike, and the Masorets have done well to regard **הוּא** as nothing but a clerical error, and to substitute for it the correct **היא**¹. The same pretended archaism may be found in the famous Babylonian codex of the Prophets published by Strack, e.g. Hosea ii. 4, **הוּא** (i.e. **היא**), Joel iv. 1, **הִהוּא** (i.e. **הִיָּהוּא**).

To proceed. The same primitive difference of the vowels and the same affixed syllable are to be found in Arabic, although slightly obscured, since *hu-a* and *hī-a* have become *hūwa* **هُوَ** and *hīya* **هِيَ**. In Ethiopic these words have received a further

¹ [Cf. Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, 2nd ed. vol. i. (Leyden, 1887), § 16 and n. 7, who rightly refers the origin of the error to the old *scriptio defectiva* **הא**, for **הוּא** and **היא** alike.]

increment at the end, and in consequence have suffered a slight curtailment at the beginning. The forms in actual use are 𐤓𐤌𐤕 : $wē'ētū$, fem. 𐤓𐤌𐤕 : $yē'ētī$, which have obviously lost an initial $hū$ and $hī$ on account of their having been lengthened by the syllable $tū$ and $tī$. I find the same increment in the Assyrian demonstrative *suatū*, "this," fem. *šaatī* or *šātī* [Del. *šiatī*], and in another form in *šāšū*, fem. *šāšī*, *šāšā*, as also in *hagā-sū* (Del. *agāsu*), which last is found mainly in inscriptions of the Persian period. *Šū* seems to be only a weakening of *tū*, just as in Greek the pronoun *tu*, Doric $\tauύ$, became $σύ$; or $τήμερον$ (to-day), $τήτες$ (this year) became $σήμερον$ and $σῆτες$; or the nominal terminations $τις$, $τιος$, $τια$, $τυνη$, passed into $σις$, $σιος$, $σια$, $συνη$ ($πέψις$, $πλούσιος$, $γερουσία$, $δικαιοσύνη$). Indeed it seems possible that *tū* is the oldest form of the pronoun of the 3rd pers. in Semitic, of which *sū* and *hū* are successive weakenings.

We have then the following forms of the pronoun of the 3rd person.

	singular	plural	dual
Assyr. m.	𐤓𐤌	šūnu , šūnu-tu , šūnut	
f.	𐤓𐤌	šīna	
Arab. m.	هو (vulg. Eg. $hūwä$)	هم (Eg. <i>hum</i> and <i>huma</i>)	هما
f.	هي (vulg. Eg. $hīyā$)	هن	
Eth. m.	𐤓𐤌𐤕 : $wē'ētū$	𐤓𐤌𐤕𐤕 : $ēmūntū$ or 𐤓𐤌𐤕𐤕 : $wē'ētōmū$	
f.	𐤓𐤌𐤕 : $yē'ētī$	𐤓𐤌𐤕𐤕 : $ēmāntū$ or 𐤓𐤌𐤕𐤕 : $wē'ētōn$	
Heb. m.	הוא (Ph. הא)	הם , הֵם	
f.	היא (Ph. הא)	הֵנָּה	
J. Ar. m.	הוא	הֵמוֹ , הֵמוֹן ; הֵמֹן	
f.	היא	הֵמֹן	

	singular	plural
Syr. m.	ܐܢܝܐ	ܐܢܝܐܐܢܝܐ
f.	ܐܢܝܐ	ܐܢܝܐܐܢܝܐ
Talm. m.	אֵינִי	אֵינֵינוּ
f.	אֵינִי	אֵינֵינוּ
Mand. m.	ܗܘ	ܗܝܢܘܢ
f.	ܗܝ	ܗܝܢܝܢ

After what I have already said, in this and former lectures, very few of these forms call for any further remark. I need only add, I think, that *هم*, *هم*, vulgar Egypt. *hum*, *huma*, *הֵם*, *הֵם*, and *הֵמוֹן*, *הֵמוֹן*, are really identical, the last being strengthened by an additional demonstrative element, as is also the case with *אֵינִי*: and *אֵינֵינוּ*: The Talmudic forms *אֵינִי* and *אֵינֵינוּ* (for *אֵינִי* and *אֵינֵינוּ*) shew us that the double *n* of the Chaldee, Syriac and Mandaitic is an assimilation of *nh*, the syllable *in*, *en*, *hen* being, as I formerly stated, an interjectional or demonstrative element prefixed to the pronoun. The simple *ܐܢܝܐ* and *ܐܢܝܐ* of the old Syriac have entirely disappeared in the modern language; and in the modern dialects of Ethiopia the place of this pronoun has been usurped by later compounds. Thus in Tigrīña, *něssū*, fem. *něssā*, plur. masc. *něssātōm*, fem. *něssātōn*, for *něfsū*, etc.; and in Amharic, *እሱ*: *ěrsū*, fem. *እሷ*: *ěrsēwā*, plur. *እሳቸው*: *ěrsātəwə*, or with a further assimilation *እሱ*: *ěssū*, etc., from *ርእስ*: *rě's*, "head."

On the formation of the plurals of the personal pronouns, I shall make some additional remarks when I come to treat of that subject in relation to the noun and verb. Meantime I pass on to the other classes of pronouns.

B. The Demonstrative Pronouns.

From the pronoun of the 3rd person, by prefixing the demonstrative particle or interjection *hā*, in vulgar Arabic *ā*, we get the compound pronoun *hā-hū*. This appears in the

Talmūd as **הָהוּא**, fem. **הָהִיא**, plur. **הֵנָּהוּ** (for **הָהֵנָּהוּ**). The word is often wrongly pointed **הָהוּא**, **הָהִיא**, whereby it is confounded with the Hebrew **הָהוּא**, **הָהִיא**, which is of a totally different origin, viz. by assimilation for **הַלְהוּא**. In Mandaitic the same word exists in the singular, **הַהוּע**, **הַהוּו**, without any corresponding plural. In Syriac the second *h* was elided, and the syllables *hā-ū*, *hā-ī*, contracted into **ܐܘܗܐܘ** *hau*, **ܐܘܗܐܝܐ** *hāy* or *hōy*, plur. **ܐܘܗܐܢܐܘܢ** *hānnūn*, **ܐܘܗܐܢܐܝܢ** *hānnēn* (for *hā-ēn-hūn*, *hā-ēn-hēn*). In the Palestinian dialect we also find the singular forms **ܐܘܪܐ**, **ܐܘܪܐ**; fem. **ܐܘܪܐܝܐ**, **ܐܘܪܐܝܐ**, but not the plural. In modern Syriac the corresponding words are **ܐܘܪܐ** *aw*, **ܐܘܪܐܝܐ** *ay*, often written and pronounced **ܐܘܪܐ**, **ܐܘܪܐܝܐ**, **ܐܘܪܐܝܐ**, *ō*, *ō*, *ā*, *ō* and *ē*, with the plur. **ܐܘܪܐܝܐܢܐ** *ānī* (from the old fem. **ܐܘܪܐܝܐܝܐ**), shortened into **ܐܘܪܐܝܐ** *ān* and **ܐܘܪܐܝܐ** *an*. From this is formed another pronoun by the addition of the particle **ܐܘܪܐܝܐ** at the end, to designate a more remote object; "that," "yonder," viz. **ܐܘܪܐܝܐܢܐ** (**ܐܘܪܐܝܐܢܐ**), *ō'ā*, fem. **ܐܘܪܐܝܐܢܐܝܐ**, *ē'ā*. The *n* which we have found in the plurals **ܐܘܪܐܝܐܢܐ**, etc., seems to appear in the singular in the Assyrian *annu*, "this," whether we regard it as merely = *an* + *hū*, or as = *ā* + *in* + *hū*. The forms given by the grammarians are:

sing. masc. *annu* (fem. *annat*), (*annit*)

plur. masc. *annūtu* fem. *annātu*, *annītu*,

with another plural form, perhaps of both genders, *annī* or *annē*.

In vulgar Arabic of Egypt the forms corresponding to **הָהוּא**, **הָהִיא**, **הֵנָּהוּ**, are still used with the original interjectional force: *āhō*, "there he is," *āhī*, "there she is," *āhūm* or *āhōm*, "there they are."

A very large number of demonstrative pronouns have their source in the cognate letters *d* and *t*, in juxtaposition with which we often find *h*, *l* and *n*. You will remember that Aram. **ܕܐ** *d* = Arab. **ذ** *dh*, **ܕܐ** = Eth. Heb. Assy. *z*; and that Aram. **ܬܐ** *t* = Arab. **ث** *th*, **ܬܐ** = Eth. **ሐ**: *s*, Assy. *š*, Heb. **שׁ** *sh*.

One of the simplest of these pronouns is the Arabic ذَا, fem. *أُولَئِكَ*, plur. *أُولَئِكَ*, often written *plene* *أُولَئِكَ*. The corresponding forms in vulgar Arabic are *dā* or *dē*, fem. *dī*, plur. *dawl* or *dōl*, *dōla*, *dōlī* (which seems to arise from a combination of the singular with the ancient plural). In Ethiopic we have the same word in the form ዘ: *zē*, fem. ዛ: *zā*, plur. ለሁ: *ellū*, fem. ለሁ: *ellā*. Its Hebrew equivalent is זֶה, fem. זֵה, for *zāt*, shortened into זֶה and זֵה, plur. אֵלֶּה (1 Chron. xx. 8, generally with the art. אֵלֶּה, אֵלֶּה). The Phoenician forms are, as might be expected, very similar; viz. 𐤆 for both genders (perhaps with a difference of pronunciation, *zē*, *zū*); fem. also זֵה, in Plautus *syth*; plur. אֵלֶּה, in Plautus *ily*. The form אֵלֶּה, which also occurs in Phoenician, has been regarded as equivalent to the Hebrew הֵנָּה; but the article in Phoenician is the same as in Hebrew, and 𐤆 does not take the article in Phoenician even when the preceding substantive is defined (𐤆 מְשַׁבֵּב and 𐤆 הַשְּׂעִיר). I prefer therefore to consider the *aleph* in אֵלֶּה as merely prosthetic. The very curt form of the word 𐤆 might readily lead to such a vowel being prefixed; and we find some support for this idea in the modern Ethiopic or Tigrīna form ለዘ: fem. ለዛ:: In the later Hebrew of the Mishnah we have masc. זֶה, fem. זֵה (*zō* or *zū*), plur. אֵלֶּה. In Assyrian it is curious to find the form with *l* in the singular as well as the plur.;

sing. masc. <i>ullu</i>	fem. <i>ullat</i>
plur. masc. <i>ullūtu</i>	fem. <i>ullītu</i> ² .

By appending a demonstrative *n* to the masculine, we obtain the common J. Aram. form ܕܢ, ܕܢܐ, emphatic ܕܢܐ, ܕܢܐ, with its simple fem. ܕܢܐ, ܕܢܐ, and its plur. ܕܢܐ. The corresponding

¹ [The latter only in the Pentateuch, where it is probably to be viewed as a mere *scriptio defectiva* (ܕܢܐ) as in Phoenician. Cf. Kuenen *ut supra*. In any case ܕܢܐ is younger than ܕܢܐ, final ܢ being readily lost in Hebrew, as in רע = רעה.]

² [The feminines are not recognised by Delitzsch.]

Phoenician forms are **ן** and **נ**; and in certain Aramaic dialects (Egypto-Aram., Nabathean) these words appear as **ננ** and **נ**. An Ethiopic form, with further demonstrative increment, is **ዝንቱ**: *zēntū*, fem. **ዛንቱ**: *zātī*, plur. **እኑንቱ**: *ellōntū*, fem. **እኑንቱ**: *ellāntū*.

For the sake of still greater emphasis, *hā* is prefixed to these forms, giving in Arabic **هَذَا**, fem. **هَذِهِ** or **هَذِي**, **هَاتَا**, **هَاتِي**, plur.

هَؤُلَاءِ or **هَؤُلَئِي**; and vulgarly *hādā*, fem. *hādī*, plur. *hādau*, and in Africa *hāḏām*. In Egypt, with somewhat of the original interjectional force, *ādī*, "this here." The corresponding Aramaic words vary considerably in form according to the dialects. In the Targūms and the Talmūd we find **הָרִין**, fem. **הָרָא** (or **עָרָא**), plur. **הָרִין** and **הָרִין** (less correctly pronounced **הָרִין** and **הָרִין**); and similarly in the Palestinian dialect **סִנְיָ** or

סִנְיָ, fem. **סִנְיָ** (*hādī* for *hādā*), plur. **סִנְיָ**. In Mandaitic **י** has generally taken the place of **ר**; **הָאִין**, fem. **הָאִין**, plur. **הָאִין**. **הָאִין** however occurs, as also the compound **הָאִין** = Talmud.

הָרִין, i.e. **הָרִין**. The ordinary Syriac forms are **סִנְיָ**, fem. **סִנְיָ**, plur. **סִנְיָ**. Of these, **סִנְיָ** stands for **הָרִין**, and **סִנְיָ** is weakened from **סִנְיָ**, which occurs in the combination **סִנְיָ** (for **סִנְיָ**).

Shorter forms are **סִנְיָ**, for **הָרִין**, and **סִנְיָ**. Here too must be placed the Talmudic **הָרִין** or **הָרִין**, which latter is also found in Samaritan. Here **ס** has taken the place of **ה**, whilst the aspirated **ד** *dh* is represented only by the aspiration *h*. This gradual elision of the *d*, combined with the ordinary dropping of the final *n*, enables us to explain the common Talmudic forms **הָרִין**, fem. **הָרִין**, plur. **הָרִין** or **הָרִין**, as corruptions of **הָרִין**, **הָרִין**, and **הָרִין**. The modern Syriac words are very similar, viz. **ሰን** *āhā* or **ሰ** *ā*, plur. **ሰ** *annā*. **ሰ** springs from the fem. **ሰ**, the original aspirated *d* (*dh*) being represented, as in **ሰ**, by an *h*; *h* having been gradually

dropped, $\bar{a}'\bar{a}$ has been contracted into \bar{a} . Dialectically the forms אָב, אָב, are also used, both from אָב.

Now if to these series of pronouns we append the letter ך, we obtain another series, generally designating more distant objects.

The simplest of these is the J. Aram. דָּךְ or דִּיכִי, fem. דָּךְ, plur. אֲלִיךְ, which are formed from דָּן, דָּא and אֲלִין. The Palestinian dialect exhibits the plural in the form אֲלִיכְךְ. By prefixing *hā* we arrive at the Talmudic דָּךְ, fem. דָּךְ, plur. דָּךְ or דָּךְ, and the Mandaitic דָּךְ (masc. and fem.), plur. דָּךְ, which are contractions for דָּךְ, דָּךְ, and דָּךְ. Here too the Syriac varieties אֲלִיכְךְ, fem. אֲלִיכְךְ, find their place; the former of which may perhaps be compounded with a form corresponding to the Mishnaic אֲלִי. As for אֲלִיכְךְ (אֲלִיכְךְ), which is always masc., it is probably not a mere variation of אֲלִיכְךְ, but a different compound, viz. from אֲלִי and אֲלִי. In Arabic the corresponding pronoun is تَاكَ. fem. تَاكَ. plur. أُولَئِكَ or أُولَئِكَ. The Arabs have, however, regarded the suffixed كِي as being the pronoun of the 2nd person, and hence, though ذَاكَ is commonly used in speaking to two or more persons of both sexes, it is also permitted to use ذَاكَ in addressing a woman, ذَاكُمَا in speaking to two, and ذَاكُم or ذَاكُن in speaking to several, according to their sex. The vulgar forms, at least in North Africa, are ذَاكَ *dāk*, fem. ذَاكَ *dāk*, plur. ذَاكَ *dūk*. In Egypt we find, with the addition of *hā*, the forms *dikhā* (masc. fem.) and *dukhā* (masc.); and these may be still further strengthened by appending the pronoun of the 3rd pers., masc. *dukhauwā*, masc. fem. *dikhaiya*, plur. masc. fem. *dukhamma*. The Ethiopic presents us with this augmented pronoun in

the form ܚܢ : *šekū*, fem. ܠܢܬܝܢ : *entekū*, plur. ܠܠܝܢ : *ellikū*. Here the fem. is remarkable, but we shall speak of it when we come to the simple relative form ܠܢܬܝܢ : *ēnta*.

These pronouns again may be heightened by the accession of a fresh demonstrative syllable. Thus in Chaldee we find ܕܢܝܢ for both genders, with additional *n*. The Ethiopic presents us with a form with additional *tū*, viz. ܚܢܬܝܢ : *šekwētū* or ܚܢܬܝܢ : *šektū*, fem. ܠܢܬܝܢܬܝܢ : *entāktī*, plur. ܠܠܝܢܬܝܢܬܝܢ : *ellikwētū* or ܠܠܝܢܬܝܢܬܝܢ : *elliktū*. The Arabic prefixes *hā* in the form هَٰذَا , fem. هَٰذَاكَ , plur. هَٰؤُلَآئِكَ ; which are much used in the vulgar dialects, هَٰذَا *hādāḱ*, هَٰذِيكَ *hādīḱ*, plur. هَٰؤُلَآئِكَ *hā'ulā'ik*, or in North Africa هَٰذِيكَ *hādīḱ*. From *hādāḱ* seems to arise, by elision of the *d*, the form هَٰكَ *hak*, used by the Bedouins; just as هَٰذَا *hādā*, in combination with the article 'al, becomes *hal*, which is used for all numbers and genders, as هَٰلِكُنَّ , هَٰلِكُتَاب , هَٰلِكُتَاب . Another strengthened form in old Arabic is ذَٰلِكَ , where the letter *l* has been inserted between ذَٰ and كَ : its fem. is تَٰلِكَ , by contraction for تَٰيِلِكَ . Peculiar to the Mandaitic is the word ܠܠܝܢܬܝܢܬܝܢ (masc. and fem.), plur. masc. ܠܠܝܢܬܝܢܬܝܢ , fem. ܠܠܝܢܬܝܢܬܝܢ . Here it seems tolerably clear that we have again the prefixes ܠܠܝܢ and ܠܠܝܢܬܝܢܬܝܢ , contracted into ܠܠܝܢܬܝܢܬܝܢ , and the suffixes of the 3rd person; but it is not so easy to say what is represented by the letters ܠܠܝܢܬܝܢܬܝܢ , unless we admit Noeldeke's suggestion that they are identical with ܠܠܝܢܬܝܢܬܝܢ , the Aramaic form of ܠܠܝܢܬܝܢܬܝܢ .

Finally, under this head, we have a few demonstratives that are formed by means of the prefix ܠܠܝܢ *l*. Here I mention first, though somewhat doubtfully, the Talmudic pronoun ܠܠܝܢܬܝܢܬܝܢ , fem.

אִיהִי; doubtfully, I say, because it may also be explained, as I did above, by assimilation from אִינְהוּ, אִינְהִי. This latter view is countenanced by the plurals אִינְהוּ, אִינְהִי. The forms נִיהוּ and נִינְהוּ, representing the substantive verb, seem to be fresh compounds of the demonstrative *n* and אִיהוּ, אִינְהוּ; e.g. מֵאִי נִיהוּ “what it is,” אֲנֵא נִיהוּ “it is I,” צְדִיקִין גְּמֹרִי נִינְהוּ “they are perfectly righteous men.” More certain examples of this formation with prefixed *ī* are אִידִי (for אִידִין), fem. אִידָא; and אִידָךְ, plur. אִינָךְ.

To designate a definite pronominal accusative, especially of a somewhat emphatic kind, we find in the Semitic languages a peculiar word joined with the pronominal suffixes. In Ethiopic this is ከ, *kīyā*, a word regarding the origin of which various conjectures have been hazarded, but which I am inclined to think finds its source in the demonstrative *k*, to which we have so often referred. From this are formed, with the usual pronominal suffixes, *kīyā-ya*, *kīyā-ka*, etc. By the weakening of כ into ה (of which I gave some examples in a former lecture), we obtain the Arabic dialectic form هيا. From this it is but a step to the common Arabic ايا *īyā*, which is used precisely like its Ethiopic equivalent, and appears in Tigrīna in the contracted form of ከ, *ī*, denoting *self*, as ከ: *īyē*, ከ: *īkhā*, ከ: *īyū*. In the other Semitic languages this word takes the feminine termination *at* or *t*, probably appended to it in order to bring out more strongly the abstract idea of *hoccitas* (if I may use such a word); and in these languages its range of use is considerably wider than in Arabic and Ethiopic. Hence we get, in the first place, the Phoenician אית, which was doubtless pronounced in the earlier stages of the language *īyāth* or *īyath*; for otherwise the *y* would not have been inserted in writing, as is almost invariably the case in the older inscriptions. In the inscriptions of later date, however, we find את, and Plautus heard the word pronounced *yth*. The Aramaic forms seem to be shortened from the Phoen., viz. Syr. ܐܬ, Chald. ית, less correctly ית. These

are used not only as a sign of the definite accus., **כִּנְעַנְדָּהּ** **כִּן**; but also as a substantive, signifying *self*, e. g. **סֹס יִדְעָהּ לִפְנֵי** "he who knows himself," **כִּנְעַנְדָּהּ** "free-will"; and likewise in the Palestinian dialects and in Samaritan to form demonstratives, as in the phrases **בִּיתָהּ יוֹמָהּ** "on that same day," **בִּיתָהּ שָׁתָהּ** "in that same year," **סֹס אֵלֶּה** "at that same time," **סֹס אֵלֶּה הַנִּינִן לִי** "that man is a thief," **יֵין הַנִּינִן לִי יִתְהוֹן לֹא הַנִּינִן לִי** "this is of use to me, those are not." In this way we may best explain the Mandaitic demonstrative spoken of above, **הַאֲנַתָּה** (masc. and fem.), **הַאֲנַתִּין**, where **את** is probably = **ית**. Similarly in Hebrew *yāth* was further altered into *āth*, whence, by the usual change of *ā* into *ō*, resulted the common form *ōth*, **אוֹת**. In close connection with a following word this *ōth* was shortened into *ō*, just as from **נַחֲשֶׁת** and **שְׁלִשֶׁת** we get **נַחֲשֶׁתִי** and **שְׁלִשֶׁתִּם**. Next, *ō* was changed into *ē*, **אֶת־**, as in **אֶתֶּם** for *attūm*; and finally this **אֶת־** was heightened by the tone into **עֵת־**, **את**. In later Hebrew, perhaps under the influence of the surrounding Aramaic dialects, **אוֹת** came to be used, like **ית**, as a demonstrative: **יָשַׁב לוֹ אוֹתוֹ, בְּאוֹתָהּ שָׁעָה, בְּאוֹתוֹ הַיּוֹם** "that one sat down," **וְכוֹר אוֹתוֹ הָאִישׁ לְטוֹב**. In Assyrian I find a word *attu*, which seems to be nearly connected with *yāth* and *ōth*, for example in such phrases as *attūa abūa* "my father" ("mon père à moi"), *širya attūa* "my family" (**זרע**), *dināta attūa* "my laws" (**דין**), *bīta attūnu* "our house," *ša la iptallaḥū ābīya wa attua* "who revere (**פלה**) not my father and me." Schrader also regards as cognate with *yāth* the words *yātī* and *āšī*, in such phrases as *yātī Nabūnahūd šuzibanni*, "as for me, Nabunit, save (**שיזב**) thou me"; and again, *ša lū iplahū abūtiya u āšī lū išbatū nūr sarrūtiya*, "who did not fear my fathers, and, as regards me, did not take up the yoke of my rule." These words *yātī* and *āšī* he explains as made up of *ya* + *a* + *tī* or *šī*, i. e. *ya* for *yath*, *a* suffix of the 1st pers., and a further demonstrative *tī* or *šī*. Sayce, however, gives a differ-

ent explanation of both words, so that we are evidently on unsafe ground. Even the Hebrew אֹת has been explained in a manner different from that which I have just suggested to you, for some scholars have regarded it as a substantive, nearly equivalent in form and meaning to the Arabic ⁵أَيَّ “sign” or “mark,” “form” or “body,” thus identifying it with the word אֹת (for אֹת or אֹת), or else assuming a form אֹת or אֹת, from the construct state of which (אֹת or אֹת) אֹת might be derived by contraction.

Before quitting the demonstrative pronouns, I will say a few words regarding the definite article, which really belongs to this class of words. Its original form was, in all probability, הַל, a compound of *hū* and *l*, nearly in the sense of the Latin *ille*, connected with the adverbs הֵלָּא “away,” “beyond,” and הֵלֶם “here,” “hither.” In Hebrew the *l* was assimilated to all following letters; and when the doubling wholly ceased to be audible, the loss of it was compensated by the heightening of the vowel into *á* ַ, as in הָאִישׁ, הָהָר, הָעִיר, הָרֹאשׁ, on which and other modifications of the article see your Hebrew grammars. In Phœnician its form is the same as in Hebrew, but it is not so frequently used as in the latter language, e.g. מִשְׁכַּבּוֹ for הַמִּשְׁכַּבּ הַזֶּה, הַשְׁעָר הַזֶּה for הַשְׁעָרָא, הָאִדָּם for הָאִדָּם, הַהוּא for הַמְּלִכָּה הַזֶּה.

The Arabs ordinarily weakened the initial ה to א, but restricted the assimilation of the final *l* to a following dental, sibilant or liquid (the so-called *solar letters* ت ث د ذ ر ز س ش), e.g. ⁵الْإِنْسَانُ, ⁵الْجَبَلُ, ⁵الْمَدِينَةُ, but ⁵النَّوْرُ (النَّوْرُ), (ص ض ط ظ ل ن); e.g. ⁵النَّهْرُ, ⁵النَّهْرُ (النَّهْرُ), ⁵الشَّمْسُ. In Egypt this assimilation is nowadays extended to ج and ك, as *eg-gazzār*, *eg-gum'a* “Friday,” *ek-kull*, *ek-kenīse* “church.” The letter *l*, however, though assimilated in pronunciation, is always written. The Arabian Bedouins are still said to retain the old pronunciation *hal*, saying

has-sanah instead of *as-sanah*, **הַשָּׁנָה**. Generally speaking, however, the initial *clif* is regarded as so weak in sound that it suffers elision whenever another word precedes, e. g. **أَبُو الْمَلِكِ** *abu 'l-maliki*, not *abū al-maliki*, **فِي النَّاسِ** *fi 'n-nāsi*, not *fī an-nāsi*, **قَالَتِ الْمَرْأَةُ** *kāla 'r-rajulu*, not *kāla ar-rajulu*, **كَالَتِي الْمَرْأَةُ** *kālātī 'l-mar'atu*, not *kālāt al-mar'atu*. Indeed it was at times dropped altogether and only the *l* sounded, and this is common at the present day, e. g. *lahmar* "red," *liswid* "black," *lashar*, the "Azhar" mosque, *letnēn* "the two."

In Ethiopic there is no definite article, and the same appears to be the case in Assyrian. The Aramaic dialects labour under the same deficiency, but make up for it by appending to the noun the demonstrative *hā* or *ā*, which appears in writing as an *aleph*; thus **הַבַּיִת**, **הַבַּיִתָּא**, **הַבַּיִתָּא**. With this we may compare the postpositive *en* and *et* of the Scandinavian tongues, derived from an older *inn* and *it* (e. g. Danish *Mand*, *Manden*; *Hus*, *Huset*), of which we shall have to make mention again hereafter. More to our present purpose, however, is the Hīmyaritic suffixed *n*, e. g. in **מוֹנֵדָן** "this monument" or "tablet," **שְׁעָדְלָה** | **וּבְנָהוּ** | **בְּנוּ** | **מִרְתָּרִם** | **הַקִּנְיִ** | **אֶלְמָקָה** | **דָּהָרְן** | **מוֹנֵדָן** ; or in **חֲמֵעָתָת** | **בֵּן** | **וְשָׁבָן** | **עֵרָב** | **שְׁמֵהָעֵלִי** | **מִשְׁלָמָן** "this stone," **מִשְׁלָמָן** | **עֵתָתָר** | **מִשְׁלָמָן** . The words **מוֹנֵדָן** and **מִשְׁלָמָן** are apparently contractions of **מוֹנֵדָהָן** and **מִשְׁלָמָהָן**, as seems to result from such forms as **בֵּין** | **מִחַפְדָּנִיהָן** | "between these two towers" or "castles," **אֲבַעַל** | **בֵּיתָנָהָן** | "the lords of these two houses," **בֵּיתָנָהָן** "this house of ours" (where the **נ** is the suffix of the 1st pers. plur.²). Often the demonstrative pronoun **דֵּן**, fem. **דָּת**, is prefixed to such words, as **דֵּן מוֹנֵדָן**.

¹ [This statement rests on a misconception: **هَازِي السَّهْ** stands for **هَازِي السَّهْ**. Nöld.]

² Other examples are: **דֵּן סִטְרָן**, "this inscription"; **דֵּן וְתָנָן**, "this idol"; **דֵּן פִּתְחָן**, "this door"; **דֵּן מִבְּנֵן**, "this building"; **דֵּן צִלְמָן**, "this statue"; **וּאֲבַלְנָהָן**, "and these two camels."

C. *The Relative Pronouns.*

The relative in its simplest form is, it may be said, identical with the demonstrative pronoun. As the Germans use *der* instead of *welcher*, and we English *that* instead of *who*, so did the Semites employ closely cognate or identical words as demonstratives and relatives.

The simplest of the relative forms is the **וְ** of the Biblical Aramaic, shortened in the Targums and in Syriac into **ܐܝܬ**, **ܐܝܬܐ**. One or other of these forms appears in all the Aramaic dialects except the Egyptian and that of some ancient inscriptions, which have **וּ**. The Mandaites say *āl* as well as *dāl*, and the same form **ܐܝܬܐ** is occasionally found in Samaritan. I need only remark in addition that in Mandaitic **ܐܝܬܐ** is used in a few cases instead of the common **ܐܝܬܐ**, as **ܐܝܬܐ ܕܥܡܐܢ** "he who does good," **ܐܝܬܐ ܕܥܡܐܢ** "he who does evil" (where **ܐܝܬܐ** = **ܐܝܬܐ**); **ܐܝܬܐ ܕܐܬܐܬܐܬܐܢ** "spirit of our fathers." The word **ܐܝܬܐ**, which is mentioned by Gesenius and others as the Mandaitic form of the relative, has no existence, being merely a false reading of the somewhat abbreviated character of the word **ܐܝܬܐ**. In modern Syriac **ܐܝܬܐ** or **ܐܝܬܐ** is frequently employed for **ܐܝܬܐ**, as **ܐܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܐ** (for **ܐܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܐ**) "the Saviour of the world," **ܐܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܐ** (for **ܐܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܐ**) "forgiveness of sins," **ܐܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܐ** (for **ܐܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܐ**) "the passion of our Lord," *bārīt īshū*, i.e. **ܐܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܐ**, "after Jesus."

Identical with this **ܐܝܬܐ** or **ܐܝܬܐ** is the Arabic **ذُو**, generally employed in this one form for both genders and all numbers; as **ذُو ٱلَّذِي ٱتَّٰنٰنِيْ ذُو ٱلَّذِي ٱتَّٰنٰنِيْ** "he who said that came to me," **ذُو ٱلَّذِي ٱتَّٰنٰنِيْ** "my well which I dug." The use of this word is, however, only dialectic. In S. Arabia the Ḥimyaritic furnishes us with similar forms: masc. **ذُو** (= **ذُو**), fem. **ذُو**, plur. **ذُو** or **ذُو**.

In Ethiopic we find **H**: *zā*, with a fem. **ጸላ**: *ēnta*, and a plur. **ጸላ**, all bearing a striking resemblance to the corresponding

forms of the demonstratives. H: *sa* may be used, like **ה** and **זו**, for both genders and numbers. The fem. **זאת**: we must trace back to the demonstrative particle *en*, or the letter *n*, plus the fem. termination *t*; and the plur. **אל**: to the demonstrative letter *l*. In Hebrew occurs the cognate form **זו**, likewise invariable.

In Arabic and Hebrew the simple article **ה**, **ה**, is sometimes employed as a relative; e.g. **مِنَ الْقَوْمِ الرَّسُولِ اللَّهِ مِنْهُمْ** "of the people of whom is the Apostle of God," for **الَّذِينَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ مِنْهُمْ**; Joshua x. 24, **הַהֹלְכִים אִתּוֹ** "who went with him"; 1 Sam. ix. 24, **וְהַעֲלִיָּה אֶת-הַשּׁוֹק וְהַעֲלִיָּה**; 1 Chron. xxvi. 28, **וְהַקֹּדֶשׁ שְׂמוּאֵל**.

Hence, from a combination of these two words, with the insertion of the demonstrative letter *l* (as in **ذَلِكَ**), arises the ordinary Arabic relative **الَّذِي**, with its fem. **الَّتِي**, for the full inflection of which see the Arabic grammar. Its form in the vulgar dialects is **إِلِي** *ellī*, in Maltese even shortened into **לי** *lī*, for all the genders and numbers. Identical with **الَّذِي** in form, though not exactly in meaning, is the Hebrew demonstrative **הַלֵּז**, shortened into **הֵלֵז**, just as **الَّذِي** is sometimes found in the form **הֵלֵז**. **הֵלֵז** is used as fem. in 2 Kings iv. 25, **הֵנָּה** **הֵלֵז**, and another form, **הַלְלֵז** *hallēzī*, also occurs as fem. in Ezekiel xxxvi. 35, **הָאָרֶץ הַלְלֵז הַנִּשְׁמָה**. This last seems to be weakened from **הַלְלֵז**, and to exhibit this pronoun in even a purer form than **הַלֵּז** and **الَّذِي**.

The relative pronoun in Assyrian is *ša* or *šā*, which admits of no variation, but is evidently connected with the simple pronoun *šū*, "he," and the demonstrative *ša-su*.

The Hebrew word אֲשֶׁר, though familiar to us all, is difficult to analyse. Some, as for instance Fleischer, Mühlau and Sayce, following an older scholar named Tsepregi, regard אֲשֶׁר as the Hebrew representative of the Aramaic אַתְרִי, “place,” in Syriac also “trace,” “track,” “footstep,” as in אַתְרִי (for *ba-athar*) “after,” “behind,” Arab. ^{اثر} and ^{اثر}, “trace,” “track,” “footstep,”

Eth. ለወር:: In support of this view they appeal to analogies in other languages, e. g. the Chinese, where *so* means both “place” and “which,” and to the vulgar use of *wo* in German, for example, “Der Mann, *wo* ich gesehen habe,” instead of *welchen*, or again, “Der Fremde, *wo* du mit ihm gegessen hast,” instead of “mit welchem du gegessen hast.” Gesenius, in his immortal work, the *Thesaurus Linguae Hebraeae*, sought to connect אֲשֶׁר with the Hebrew radical אֶשֶׁר: “Modo in tali vocabulo de etymo quaerendum est, אֲשֶׁר pr. *rectum* valuisse conjecerim ab אֶשֶׁר *rectus* fuit, deinde *recte*, *ita*, i. q. בֵּן et Germ. *so*, idque in antiquiore lingua in pron. relat. abiisse. Cf. בֵּה *ita*, et relativum בֵּי, et contra Germ. *so*, i. e. propr. relat. fem. Simonis relationem *ita* exprimi censet, quod ad sequentia rectâ tendat.” Ewald, whose opinions I would always mention with the respect due to so great a scholar,—Ewald’s latest view seems to have been that אֲשֶׁר stands for אֶשֶׁל, and is compounded of two demonstratives, ש = ת, ד, ו and ל, *plus* the prosthetic א. Finally, Friedrich Böttcher looks upon אֲשֶׁר as standing for אֶשֶׁל, and as made up of a merely prosthetic א, and a word שֶׁל, which he regards as an older form of the article הֶל (just as *su* seemed to be an older form of הוּא, or the verbal conj. הֶקֶטֶל = הֶקֶטֶל, אֶקֶטֶל). As the matter at present stands, we have to choose, I think, between Fleischer’s view on the one hand, and Ewald’s or Böttcher’s on the other; and, on the whole, I incline to the latter, in so far as I would seek the origin of the relative pronoun somewhere in the region of the demonstratives. For the

interchange of ל and ר, even in this region, compare the Syriac ܠܗܢܐ, "here," with the Chaldee ܠܗܢܐ. In Hebrew the longest form of the word is אֲשֶׁר, but there are several shorter forms, without א and usually with assimilation of the final *r* or *l* to the following letter; viz. שֶׁ, שָׁ, שׁ, but also שֵׁ (in שֶׁהֵם, Eccles. iii. 18, and according to one reading in שֶׁהוּא for שֵׁהוּא, Eccles. ii. 22). In Phoenician the word is written אש, but that the ש may originally have had a vowel is at least suggested by the transcription of words handed down to us by Latin and Greek authors, such as *Nesso esse sade* (capillus Veneris), i. e. נֶצֶה אֵשׁ שֶׁהָ. More frequent, however, are the shorter forms *as*, *es*, *ys*, *is*, and also *si*, *su*, which last correspond to the Hebrew שֵׁ; e. g. in the Poenulus, *assamar binam*, אֲשַׁמֵּר בְּנַעַם "what he says is friendly"; *ys siddobrim*, *thyfel yth chyl ys chon them liful*, i. e. (probably), אִישׁ שֶׁדִּבְרִים תִּפְעַל אֶת-כָּל-אִשׁ-בֶּן תִּם לִפְעַל, in Latin *cum fecisse aiunt, sibi quod faciundum fuit*; or, to quote another line, *yth alonim valonuth sicorathi sinacom syth*, i. e. אֶת-אֲלוֹנִים וְאֲלוֹנוֹת שֶׁקִּרְאתִי שְׁמִקוֹם זֹאת.

The use of the relative as a conjunction, and as a sign of the genitive relation between two substantives, belongs rather to the department of Syntax than of Etymology. These phenomena need cause you no surprise, if you reflect, on the one hand, that the Greek particle *ὅς* is only a case of the relative pronoun *ὅς*; and, on the other, that the Persian *iṣāfat* or connective vowel *i* in such constructions as نَامِ پدرِ من *nām-i pidar-i man*, "the name of my father," is merely a corruption of what was the relative pronoun in the older stages of the language.

I may therefore conclude my remarks on the relative by referring briefly to certain *possessive* pronouns, which are formed from it in several of the Semitic languages. In Ethiopic we find **H**:, fem. እንቲእ:, plur. እሊእ:, combined with suffixes as follows: *zī'á-ya*, *zī'á-ka*, *zī'á-hū*, *zī'á-na*, *zī'á-k'emu*, *zī'á-hómū*, etc. Here we may perhaps discern the relative **H**: *za*, in combination with the pronoun *kīyā*, or rather its Arabic form *īyā*, of which I

spoke in a former lecture. In Aramaic we meet with two forms, דִּיל and דִּיר . The former is found in the Talmūd, e.g. $\text{אֲנֵן בְּדִירָן וְאִינְהוּ בְּדִירְהוּ}$ "we (occupy ourselves) with our affairs, and they with theirs." This arises, as Luzzatto has suggested, from a combination of דִּי with יַד , "hand." It also occurs in modern Syriac in the forms دِبْ , دِبْج , دِيّ , *dīyī*, *dīyukh*, *dīyan*, etc., with elision of the *d* between two vowels. The other form דִּיל , i. e. דִּי plus the prep. לֵּ , is found in Biblical Aramaic, e.g. Dan. ii. 20— $\text{דִּי חֲכֻמָּתָא וְגִבּוֹרָתָא דִּי־לֵּהּ הָיָא}$; and prevails in the Targūms and in Syriac¹. The equivalent שָׁל , from אֲשֶׁר לֵּ , occurs in later Hebrew, as well as in Phoenician. Already in Jonah i. 7 we read בְּשָׁלְמִי "for whose cause?" and in ver. 12, בְּשָׁלִי "for my sake"; and similarly in the Poenulus *ulic silli*, הוֹלֵךְ שָׁלִי , "my guest" (lit. "wanderer"); *amma silli*, אִמָּא שָׁלִי , "my mother"; *bene silli*, בְּנִי שָׁלִי , "my son." A fuller form seems to occur on a Tyrian signet ring, viz. $\text{לְבַעֲרִיתֵן אֵשׁ אֵלֶם אֲשֶׁלְמִלְקָתָהּ רַצָּף}$ "(belonging) to Ba'al-yathon, a priest (lit. a gods'-man) of Melkart Rsph."

D. *The Interrogative Pronouns.*

The first of these to which I would direct your attention is the Arabic أَيّ *ayy*, fem. أَيّة *ayyah*, fully inflected, meaning "who, which, what?" It governs a genitive, as أَيّ أَرْضٍ or أَيّة أَرْضٍ , "which land?" أَيّ الرجلين "which of the two men?" أَيّهم أَيّهما "which of them?" أَيّ الرجال

¹ Compare the African الذي ل = ذِيَال .

² In vulgar Arabic it has become شي , or in combination with شي (thing) شَي ; لي

This word seems to me to have its ultimate source in the interrogative particle ^אא, Heb. ^אא. It is found in Ethiopic too in the sing. ^{አይ}አይ: *āy*, plur. ^{አየት}አየት: *āyyāt*, for both genders; and in the modern Tigrina it appears as ^{አይነ}አይነ: ^{አየነ}አየነ: ^{አየነ}አየነ: ^{አየነ}አየነ: or ^{አየነ}አየነ:, which are probably compounds of ^{አይ}አይ: and the Ethiopic interrogative ^ኣኣ:: In the other Semitic languages this word has more of an adverbial force, being prefixed to other words to convert them into interrogatives, and entering into the composition of a great many interrogative adverbs. In Hebrew, for example, it appears as ^עע (ē for *ay*) in ^הה ^עע, “who, which?” ^הה ^עע “from which?” ^לל ^עע “wherefore, why?” But also as an independent word in the sense of “where?” with pronom. suffixes, ^הה ^עע, ^יי ^עע, ^םם ^עע; and in a longer form without suffix, ^הה ^עע. Of compound words the most ordinary examples are:

^עע (for ^הה ^עע, Arabic ^{أين}أين, “where?” contracted ^עע, and as an accusative ^הה ^עע “whither?” ^עע, ^הה ^עע, and ^הה ^עע, “how?” ^הה ^עע “where? how?” Similar formations in Ethiopic are ^{አይ}አይ: “where?” and, with a shortening of ^{አይ}አይ: into ^አአ: ^עע, ^አአ: ^עע, “how? how!” reduplicated ^አአ: ^עע: ^עע, ^አአ: ^עע: ^עע, or ^አአ: ^עע: ^עע; and ^አአ: ^עע: ^עע: “how much? how many?” from ^አአ: ^עע: ^עע, which is properly a noun meaning “number,” “quantity.” In Aramaic we have two forms of this word, for just as the Arabic ^{أين}أين is in Hebrew ^אא, so in Aramaic we find both ^עע and ^הה. The latter, ^הה, is the ordinary form in the Talmūd Bābli and in the Syriac dialect of Palestine. For instance, in the Talmūd, ^הה ^עע or ^הה ^עע, fem. ^הה ^עע or ^הה ^עע “who?” “which?”; in Palestinian Syriac likewise ^{ܐܝܢ}ܐܝܢ, fem.

^{ܐܝܢ}ܐܝܢ, “why?” In Egypt, ^{ከከ}ከከ, ^{ከከ}ከከ, ^{ከከ}ከከ, as ^{ከከ}ከከ ^{ከከ}ከከ, “of what kind,” but separately ^{ከከ}ከከ, ^{ከከ}ከከ, ^{ከከ}ከከ, “who?” “which?”, where ^{ከከ}ከከ is probably for ^{ከከ}ከከ =

^{ከከ}ከከ. [So Spitta, p. 80. But Nöldeke explains the ^{ከከ}ከከ as a remnant of the old Tanwīn, ^{ከከ}ከከ ^{ከከ}ከከ, and so forth.]

וּסְמָן. Further, in the Talmūd, הִי דִנְנוּ or הִיִּדְנּוּ “who,” “which,” “what is—?” for הִיִּדִין הוּא; הֵיךְ “how?” הֵיכָה “where?” אֵהֵיָא “in respect of which?” “in reference to which?” for עַל־הֵיָא; לֵהֵיָא “to which?” “whither?” for לֵהֵיָא. In the Aramaic of the Targūms both forms occur; הֵיךְ and אֵיךְ “how?” אִידִין and הִידִין, fem. אִידָא and הִידָא, “who, which?” אֵיכָא and הֵיכָא, “where?” אֵיכְרִין and הֵיכְרִין, “how?” In Syriac we have only the forms with *aleph*, but in great abundance; for instance: אֲכַּח (ākh) “how,” “as,” with its derivatives אֲכַּחְתָּ “as,” “like,” אֲכַּחְתָּ “together,” “at once,” אֲכַּחְתָּ “as one who,” “as if,” אֲכַּחְתָּ “as”; further, אֲכַּח “where?” from אֲכַּח “here”; אֲכַּח, “how?” for אֲכַּחְתָּ and אֲכַּחְתָּ; אֲכַּחְתָּ “whence?” for אֲכַּחְתָּ; אֲכַּח for אֲכַּח, “who?” with its fem. אֲכַּח, and plur. אֲכַּח for אֲכַּח; and finally, with a shortening of אֲכַּח into אֲכַּח, “when?” in the Targūms אֲכַּחְתָּ and אֲכַּח, from the Heb. מִתִּי, Arab. مَتِي. In modern Syriac there are similar forms, though of course more or less corrupted. Such are: אֲכַּח ikā or אֲכַח ikā, “where?” אֲכַחְתָּ edānā, for אֲכַחְתָּ, “when?” iminē or imnē, “which of them?” אֲכַחְתָּ or אֲכַחְתָּ, in Talmudic אֲכַחְתָּ הִי מִנֵּיהוּ; further, אֲכַח “who?” from אֲכַח דִּנָּא and אֲכַח דָּא, with another form אֲכַח ēnā, which is, strictly speaking, derived from the old plural אֲכַחְתָּ. In Mandaitic the same interrogative exists in מִנָּא m’nā, “whence?” which is also a Talmudic form, for מִנָּא or מִנָּא, i.e. מִן אֵין; מִנָּא minnē lākh, in the Talmud מִנָּא לָךְ, undenam tibi? Also in אֲכַח or אֲכַח, lē, for אֲכַח, “whither?” מִלָּא millā, “whence?” עֲמָא or עֲמָא, “when?” אֲכַח and אֲכַח or אֲכַח, “where?” from אֲכַח, אֲכַח, with suffix אֲכַח “where is—?” in which form the real interrogative has wholly disappeared, just as in the modern Syriac

אָוּ אַ "where is he?" from אַיִן *ikā*, "where?" Here too I should mention the Mandaitic forms האַמְנִיא and האַמְנו, probably standing for הַאִי מְנַהֵן and הַאִי מְנַהֵן, e.g. בְּהַאמְנִיא תִּיהִלְפֹן "in which will ye cross over?" כּוֹרְסִיא דִּלִּיא האַמְנו הוּ "which (of them) is my throne?"

Another interrogative pronoun in the Semitic languages is that which is characterised by the initial letter *m*. Its oldest forms appear to me to be *man* for the masc., and *mant* for the fem.; but in practice *man* is used as the interrogation for persons of both sexes, "who?" whilst *mant* is employed in speaking of things, "what?"

In Ethiopic we actually find these oldest forms in use; ሙን: *mānū*, acc. ሙን: *māna*, "who?" and ሙንተ: *mēnt*, acc. ሙንተ: *mēnta*, "what?" The Himyar. form is also ሙን, but more usually ሙን, with the substitution of ʾ for ሙ. In Arabic we have ordinarily مَنْ *man* for persons, but a distinction of gender is made in the rare case of the word standing alone, when it is fully inflected, the masc. sing. being مَنْ *manū*, and the fem. مَنْ *manah* (with aspirated *h*, for مَنْت) and sometimes مَنْت *mant*. The Assyrian forms are said to be *mannu* or *manu* and *man*, which last is identical with the Aramaic מֵן, מַן. Hence arise in the Aramaic dialects, by the addition of the pronoun *hū*, such forms as Syriac مَنْ *man*; Talmudic מֵנִי, fem. מֵנִי, for מֵן הִי, מֵן הִי; Mandaitic מֵנִי; modern Syriac مَنْ, مَنْ, مَنْ, which is strictly speaking derived from the old feminine. The forms in the vulgar dialects of Abyssinia are not dissimilar to those of the ancient Ethiopic, viz. Tigrīña ሙን: "who?" and ሙንተ: *mēntāy*, rarely ሙንተ: and ለንተ: "what?" This latter is compounded of ሙንተ: and the other interrogative ለ: In Amharic the commonest forms are ሙን: "who?" and ሙን: "what," shortened from ሙንተ:.

Vulgar Arabic forms of مَنْ are مَنْ and مَنْ. The change of vowel in the former case is due to the influence of the labial *m*;

in the latter, it is the natural weakening of *ā* in the shut syllable, and is pronounced in pause *mīn* מִין. From a form resembling this last must have arisen, by the rejection of the final *n*, the Hebrew מִי “who?” It is also found in Ethiopic, but as a neuter, “what?” or else as an adverb “how!” e.g. ሊለደዎ: “how pleasant!” ሊዐበሉ: “how great is—!” ሊጠን: “how great?” “how much?” (from ጠን: “measure, quantity”). The Phoenician form of the personal interrogative seems also, from some phrases in the *Poenulus*, to have been *mā*.

The neuter form *mā* is common to the Arabic, Hebrew, Phoenician, and the Aramaic dialects, مَا, מָה, מַה; and we also find abundant traces of it in Assyrian, as I shall show you presently. This form I would venture to explain, with Fr. Böttcher, as follows. The original *mant* became by assimilation *matt*; the doubling was gradually dropped, because hardly audible, at the end of the word, leaving *mat*. This would gradually lead to the aspiration of the final *t*, *math*. The aspirated letter would first pass into *h*, מַה, *mah*, and finally disappear altogether in pronunciation, the vowel being lengthened in the now open syllable, מָה, *māh*. Compare the different stages of such words as אַה, אָה, אֵה “anger” (Arab. أَفَّ “nose”), or תַּת, with suffix תַּתִּי, from תַּת, תַּתִּי, תַּתִּי or תַּתִּי, תַּתִּי (for תַּתִּי); and the series of changes which produced the ordinary feminine termination of nouns הַ, אַ, out of the original *at*, viz. (1) *at*, (2) *ath*, תַּ, (3) *ah*, with aspirated *h* (found in Arabic in rhyme), and finally (4) *ā*, הַ, אַ. In this way too we are enabled to give an easy explanation of the *daghesh forte* which so constantly follows this word, and of the forms מָה, מַה, מֵה, as compared with those of the article הַ, הָ, הֶ, from הֶל.

From מַה by the addition of הָ we obtain in Talmudic and Mandaitic the forms מַהוּ, מַהוּ, “what is it?” מַהוּ is con-

tracted in Mandaitic into **מו** in the word **אמו** "why?" i.e. **על מארו = אל מארו**. By adding **דין** to **מא** there arises in Talmudic the word **מאי** "what?" in composition **אמאי** "wherefore?" "why?" = **על מאדין**. In ancient Syriac the same combination of **מא** with **דינא** and **דין** finally resulted in the contracted forms **مُنْ** and **مَنْ**, the latter of which was farther weakened into **مَنْ**. Hence in combination with **הו** arose the form **مُنْ הו** "what is it?" = **מַה הוּא**. In modern Syriac this same *mā-dēn* has been contracted into **ܡܢܕܢܒ**, with a rather unusual weakening of the vowel in this dialect; and this is farther shortened into **ܡܢܒ**, **ܡܢܒܐ**, and even **ܡܢܒ**, as in **ܡܢܒ ܕܝܒܝܪ** "what shall we do?"

With regard to the neutral **مَا** in Arabic, I may observe that it is not unfrequently shortened into **مَا** *mā*, especially in connection with prepositions, as **مَعَّ، عَنَّم، إِلَيْم، عَلَيَّم** for **مَعَّ، عَنَّم، إِلَى، عَلَى**. These last two words are still further abbreviated in poetry into **لِم** and **بِم**, which shows us the origin of the word **كَمْ** "how much?" standing for **كَمْ** or **كَمَا**, Syriac **ܡܠܐ**, Hebrew **כמה**. In Ethiopic this abbreviated *mā* is frequently appended to other interrogatives, with somewhat the same force as the Latin *nam*; e.g. **ጠንብጥጥ፡ (mánū-mā) እንተ፡** "who art thou, pray?" **ጠንብጥጥ፡ mēnt-nū-mā, እያቴ፡ ayté-mā, እፍ፡ ǣfó-mā, ጣእዜ፡ mā'ǣǣ-nū-mā.**

That these interrogative pronouns should pass into indefinites, with the sense of "who, whoever, what, whatever," is only what might be naturally expected, and the consideration of this point belongs rather to comparative syntax than to our present subject. Sundry forms must, however, for the sake of completeness, be noticed here. And firstly, the Assyrian words *mannū-ma*, *manná-ma*, *man-man*, by assimilation *mamman*, and

man-mā, "whoever," "any one"; *mimma*, "whatever." Of these, *manman* or *mamman* is merely a reduplication of *man*; *manāma*, *manāma*, and *manma*, are formed by the addition of *ma* to *mannu* or *man*; and *mimma* arises from a neuter *mi*, like the Ethiopic ሺ: *mī*. Similar words may be found in the modern dialects of Abyssinia. For instance, Tigriña has ሺ፡ or ሺ፡: "whoever," "any one"; and in Amharic there occurs ሺ፡, with the neuters ሺ፡ and ሺ፡፡

The indefinite *mā* is often attached in Arabic as an enclitic to another word, to give it a certain vagueness, as قَلِيلٌ مَا "a small quantity"; اَعْطِنِي كِتَابًا مَا "give me some book or other." At other times it conveys something of an intensifying force, as جِئْتُ لِمَا "thou art come for some matter" (of importance); whence أَيُّ فِتًى مَا is often nearly equivalent to أَيُّ فِتًى "what a youth!" "what a man!" Hence we obtain an easy explanation of such a word as the Chaldee מְדַע "something," which is in reality a contraction of מַדַּע מַא "scibile quid." All the other forms of this word are only more or less corrupted; e.g. Chald. מְדַע (like מְדַע for מַדַּע), Mand. מִנְרַם, Syr. مَدْعَا, Talmud. מִדֵּי, modern Syriac يَكْبَب. In later times the word began to be treated in some of the dialects as a simple substantive, and to form a plural; e.g. in old Syriac مَدْعَا, and in modern Syriac يَكْبِبَا, whilst the Mandaitic forms a new substantive מִנְרַא, "a thing," plur. מִנְרֵא.

To return to the Arabic مَا: we also find it used, especially with prepositions, without its apparently adding anything to the sense; e.g. مِنْ غَيْرِ مَا جَرِمَ "in every year," فِي كُلِّ مَا عَامٍ "without any offence," مِمَّا خَطِيئَاتِهِمْ "because of their sins,"

عَمَّا قَلِيل "after a little," بِمَا رَحْمَةٍ مِنَ اللَّهِ "by God's mercy." The same is the case in Hebrew, only that מֶה has in this case been modified into מו. Hence בְּמוֹ-טָלַג, Job ix. 30, *kēṛē*; בְּמוֹ-אֶפֶל, Ps. xi. 2; לְמוֹ-חָרָב, Job xxvii. 14; and בְּמוֹ-אֶבֶן, Exod. xv. 5. So also before pronominal suffixes בְּמוֹנִי, בְּמוֹךְ, בְּמוֹרוֹ. Here the Ethiopic at once shows the old form in its ከዐ: *kāma*, "as," "like," but with suffixes ከዐየ: *kamā-ya*, *kamā-ka*, *kamā-hū*, *kamā-hómū*. You will, I think, find the same weakening of *mā* to *mō* in a word which appears in the Chaldee lexicons as מוֹדְלָא or מוֹלָא "wealth," "property," with the variants מוֹדְלָא and מוֹלָא, the former of which is certainly a mere error. מוֹלָא seems to me to be identical with the Arabic مَال, which is in reality a compound of مَا "what" and ل "to," literally, "what belongs to one." In מוֹדְלָא the compound has been strengthened by the relative ד; that is to say מוֹדְלִי "my property," or מוֹדְלִיָּה "his property," is really מוֹ + ד + לִי or מוֹ + ד + לִיָּה, literally "that which is to me" or "to him."

E. The Reflexive Pronouns.

Finally, it may be as well to say a few words regarding the mode of expressing the reflex pronouns in the Semitic languages, though this pertains rather to the subject of comparative syntax than to our present topic.

In some cases, as you are aware, the reflex idea is conveyed by means of a peculiar form of the verb, for instance in Hebrew the Niph'al or Hithpa'el.

In other cases, the ordinary pronouns of the 3rd person have to do duty for the reflex pronouns as well; e.g. וַיִּקַּח אֶת-שְׁנֵי נַעֲרָיו אִתּוֹ, where we also say "he took two of his young men with *him*," whilst the German more accurately expresses it by "und er nahm zween (zwei) seiner Knechte mit

or ብዓል: "lord, master," as ባዕለይ: ርእሹ: "I myself have seen," እኔህ: እኔ: ብዓለይ: ለይ: "behold, it is I myself." More rare is the use of ብዓልቤት: "master of the house," e.g. መድረግ: ብዓልቤተ: ተፋሪ: "for the earth brings forth fruit (of) itself." These two are generally used for the nominative, whilst for the other cases is commonly employed ርእሷ: "head"; less frequently ነፍሷ: "soul," and ለሠ: "flesh," "body." From ነፍሷ: are formed, as I said before, the personal pronouns ነስሃ: *nessä-khā*, "thou," and ነሁ: *nessū* "he," as well as the reduplicated ነስነስ: "one another," as ተባሁሉ: ነስነሳቸው: "they spoke to one another," or "among themselves." The word ብሕቱ: *solitudo*, is also used in the sense of *self*, apparently for any case; and similarly ሰብነት: "humanity"; though these two may perhaps be restricted to the third person. In Amharic nearly the same words occur in their appropriate dialectic forms, viz. ባለቤት:, ራስ:, ነፍስ: and ሰውነት:: From ራስ: has been derived the pronoun of the 3rd person, እርሱ:, farther contracted into እሱ: *ässū*.

In Assyrian the common reflexive is *rāman*, which seems to stand for *raḥman*, just as *ruk* for *raḥuk*, רֹחֶךְ. It is therefore equivalent to the Heb. רָחֶם, or rather רַחֲמִים, τὰ σπλάγχνα, and forms with suffixes *rāmanīya*, *rāmanīka*, *ramanīšu*, etc. One might have imagined this, after the analogy of the Hebrew, to be a plural in *ān*, against which the form *ramanīšu*, with double *n*, would perhaps not have militated; but the form *ramnīšu* seems to show that the vowel of the second syllable, even though accented, was short, and might in some cases be elided.

In Biblical Hebrew the most usual word as a reflexive is נִפְּשׁ, though פָּנִים, "face, presence," is also employed, e.g. Exod. xxxiii. 14, פָּנַי יִלְכּוּ, 2 Sam. xvii. 11. עֶצֶם, "bone," is used in the Bible in speaking of things only, as בְּעֶצֶם הַשָּׁמַיִם, בְּעֶצֶם הָאָרֶץ; but in later Hebrew it is applied to persons, לְעֶצְמִי "for myself"; as are also גֶּרֶם "bone" and גּוּף "body," with which last you may compare the old German phrases *mīn līp*, *dīn līp*, for *ich* and *du*.

Among the Aramaic dialects there is some variety of usage.

In the Targūms נפש is common; in later writings גרם, which we also find in Samaritan and in the Palestinian dialect of Syriac. In Syriac نَفْسٌ and مَنَمٌ are the dominant words, نَفْسٌ being very rare. In Mandaitic נאפשא is used; whilst מַנְמַן is found in Samaritan, in the forms קנום and קלום, and may possibly also occur in Phoenician¹. I regret my inability as yet to give any satisfactory etymology of this word. Modern Syriac still makes use of نَفْسٌ *nōshā*, but far more frequently employs the word نَفْسٌ, which is merely the Persian جان *jān*, "soul"; as בְּחַיִּיבִי אֶתְּכֵן אֶתְּכֵן חַיִּיבִי "who was making my way bitter to me," יִנְחֶסֶת יִנְחֶסֶת "to shake himself."

¹ [Viz., in the inscription of Eshmūn'āzār, *C.I.S.*, No. 3, l. 4, 20. Cf. G. Hoffmann, *Ueber einige Phoen. Inschr.* (4^o Gött. 1889) p. 37.]

CHAPTER VII.

THE NOUN.

FROM the pronoun we naturally proceed to the *Noun*, in treating of which it will be most convenient for our present practical purpose to speak first of the distinction of gender, and then of the distinctions of number and case. With respect to gender and number, it may be desirable to consider the verbal forms to a slight extent along with the nominal, because there is in the Semitic languages a close resemblance in the flexion of the noun and verb, for which we look in vain in the Indo-European languages.

I. *Gender.*

The vivid imagination of the Semite conceived all objects, even those that are apparently lifeless, as endowed with life and personality. Hence for him there are but *two genders*, as there exist in nature but two sexes. All that we are accustomed to look upon as indifferent and neuter, was of necessity classed by him as either masculine or feminine, though the latter predominated, as we may see from the formation of abstract nouns, from the employment of the fem. as the impersonal form of the verb, and from other phenomena in Semitic speech. The Mandaite only pushes this use to its utmost limit, when he construes as fem. such words and expressions as מִנְדָּאם "something," כּוּלָּךְ "all that," and מָאָךְ or מֵאָךְ "what," "whatever." Even the word מָא, מֵא, מַא, the nearest approach in the Semitic languages to a neuter, is only, as I tried to show you in

a former lecture, a corruption of *mant*, which is actually the fem. of מֵן, מִן, מֵי.

There are, of course, a great many cases in which the Semitic languages, as well as others, do not mark the difference of gender by any difference of termination, both in respect of living and of inanimate objects. אִם "mother," רֵחַל "ewe," עֵינַי "eye," עִיר "city," are not designated as fem. by any external mark. But in the greater number of cases it was found convenient, if not absolutely necessary, to indicate the fem. gender by an external sign; and for this purpose the letter *t* was commonly employed as an affix.

In this simple form of affixed *t* the fem. termination is rare in Arabic, as بִּת "daughter," أُخْت "sister"; but common in Ethiopic, especially in adjectives and participles, as ለሂቅ: *lehík*, "old," ለህቅት: *lēhēkt*; ቆቂር: *fēkūr*, "beloved," ቆቂርት: *fēkért*; ጸደቅ: *ṣādēk*, "just," ጸደቅት: *ṣādēkt*; መስተመረ: *mastámhūr*, "asking mercy," መስተመረት: *mastámhért*. We find it, however, in substantives too, as ነጉሠ: *negūs*, "king," ነገሠት: *negést*, "queen"; አንስት: *anést*, "woman"; ወለት: *walätt*, "daughter," for ወለደት:: In Hebrew the simple *t* is found in some cases where the masc. ends in a single consonant, as יָלַדְתָּ "bearing," Gen. xvi. 11, Judges xiii. 5, 7; לָת "to bear," for לָדְתָּ, 1 Sam. iv. 19; אחת "one," for אחרת; but more commonly a short supplementary vowel is inserted between the last two letters, resulting in the vocalisation $\text{---} \text{---}$, or, if there be a guttural at the end of the word, $\text{---} \text{---}$, and the like; thus, חַתְּמַת, יוֹלְדַת, חַתְּמַת for חַתְּמַת, מוֹדַעַת for מוֹדַעַת, נְחֻשַׁת for נְחֻשַׁת or נְחֻשַׁת, מַאֲבֻלַת for מַאֲבֻלַת or מַאֲבֻלַת.

Instead of the simple *t*, however, we more usually find *at*, with a connective short *a*. This is by far the most common form in Arabic, as اِنْسَانٌ "man," اِنْسَانَةٌ "woman": جَدُّ "grandfather,"

قَاتِلَةٌ "killing," قَاتِلٌ "great," عَظِيمَةٌ "grandmother"; جَدَّةٌ.

In Ethiopic it is less frequent than *t*, though by no means uncommon; e.g. ረደት: "descent," ሐፍት: "garlic" (ሕፍ, ሕፍ),

ሳፋት: "she-camel" (ሳፋ), በረከት: *barakat* "blessing"

(ሕፃት), ሰጠት: "sin" (ሰጠት), ሰጠት: "tent" (ሰጠት),

ሰጠት. In Hebrew this termination is rare in the simple form of nouns: as examples take בִּרְקָה (a precious stone),

מְחִלָּה (women); צִרְפָּה (places), דְּבָרָה, אֵילָה, גִּבְעָה;

also with *kāmes*, הַקָּמָה "the pelican," בְּעֵלָה (a place), פָּרָה (Gen.

xlix. 22), חַטָּאת "sin," מִנָּה for *manayat*, "portion"; also אָחוֹת,

חַמָּה, for *ahawat*, *hamawat*. But we find it everywhere in the

so-called construct state, and also before the pronominal suffixes,

as נְחִלָּהּ, נְחִלָּתִי.

Now observe the history of these forms, from which you will perceive the absurdity of saying that the fem. termination in Hebrew is הָ, and that it becomes תְּ in the construct state.

The reverse is the fact. The original form is the תְּ of the construct, and it becomes הָ. The Ethiopic presents us with the

original form *t* or *at*. The Hebrew retained this termination in the construct state, before pronominal suffixes, and in a few other

cases. But in the simple form of the noun the aspirated תְּ passed into aspirated הָ, and finally, when this *h* was dropped,

nothing remained but the vowel, which was heightened in the open syllable into *á*, הָ, as נְחִלָּה¹. So also in Arabic; the

original *t* is retained in أخت. بنت, and in the Kōr'ān in a few

other words, e.g. سُورَةُ الْخَاءِ 76, رَحِمَتْ آلَهُ; as also before suffixes,

رَحِمَتِي. رَحِمَتْ. The next step was to the aspirated *h*, which

¹ Cf. what has been said above, p. 124, of the pronoun מֶה, מֵה, מִה.

form is used by the Arabic poets in rhyme, as, for example, when ^{العَذْلَةُ} (for ^{العَذْلَةُ}) is rhymed with ^{أَبْلَهُ} (for ^{أَبْلَهُ}) and with ^{وَوَلَهُ} (for ^{وَوَلَهُ}); or ^{السَّلَامَةُ} (for ^{السَّلَامَةُ}) with ^{أَمَامَهُ} (for ^{أَمَامَهُ}). The last step is to drop the *h*, as is done in the vulgar pronunciation, ^{العَذْلَةُ}, ^{السَّلَامَةُ}, ^{الرَّحْمَةُ}. The spelling with the dotted *ḥ* is merely a compromise of the grammarians between the old ^ت and the vulgar ^ه; if I write ^{سَنَةٌ}, I indicate at once the old pronunciation ^{سَنَتْ}, ^{سَنَتْ}, and the more recent ^{سَنَه}, ^{سَنَه}. If you ask for analogies in other languages for such changes as this of *at* into ^ا, *ath*, then into ^ا, *ah*, and finally into ^ا, ^ا, I can give you several. The final aspirated *d* of the Spaniard, for example in the word *ciudad*, has a very faint sound to an English ear, and the consonant has altogether vanished in the corresponding Italian *città* for *civitat* (i.e. *civitatem*). So also in French, in the verb, *il aime*, from *ille amât* (for *amavit*), but interrogatively *aime-t-il?* from *amât ille?* Indeed aspirated letters, in all positions, are apt to disappear entirely or else to leave no trace behind them save the mere aspiration. Compare the Talmudic ^{אֶהְיֶה} for ^{אֶהְיֶה}, and the modern Syriac ^{ܐܘܬܝܢ} for ^{ܐܘܬܝܢ}; or, to go a little farther afield, consider the Armenian *hayr* and the Irish *athir*, both the regular equivalents in these languages of the Latin *pater*. In *hayr* an aspirated *p* remains as *h*, and an aspirated *t* has vanished (as in *père*); in *athir* an aspirated *p* has vanished, whilst an aspirated *t* remains only in writing, for the word is actually pronounced *ahir*.

Having thus, by the help of Arabic, Ethiopic and Hebrew, established the fact that the principal fem. termination in these languages is *t* or *at*, let us trace this form in the remaining Semitic tongues.

In Assyrian we find such forms as *bint* "daughter," *ihit* "one" (for *ihidt*), and the like, with simple *t*; but the usual

shape of this affix is *at*, weakened into *it*, e. g. *šarrat* "princess," *malikat* "queen," *nāḳat* "she-camel," *šanat* "year," *āšibat* "inhabiting" (יוֹשֶׁבֶת), *bilat* or *bilit* "mistress, lady," *riš'at* or *riš'it* "wickedness," *iršit* "earth."

In Phoenician the noun ends in ת, whether it be in the simple or the construct state, as in the usual dedication of the Carthaginian *ex voto* tablets לרבת לתנת, "to the goddess Tanith," or in the words from the sarcophagus of king Eshmunazar, וְאִמִּי אִמְעִשְׁתָּרְתָּ פְּהִנְתָּ עִשְׁתָּרְתָּ רִבְתָּן הַמִּלְכָּת, or again וְשִׁכְבְּ אֲנִי בְּחֵלֶת. We find however traces of a younger form in א δ, corresponding to the Hebrew הַ, very rarely in inscriptions, more frequently in the words handed down to us by classical authors: e. g. *κιννάμω*, Heb. קִנְיָה, "cassia" or "cinnamon"; *nesso*, Heb. נִצְחָה, "flower"; *Dido*, either for נִדִּיחָה, according to the explanation of the *Etymol. Magnum* *πλανήτης*, or for יִדִּיחָה; *Karḫedōn*, *Carthago*, corruption of קֶרֶת הַרְשָׁא. In the Aramaic dialects the forms run exactly parallel to the Hebrew; e. g. in Syriac the construct state ends in *ath*; the *t* is retained in the emphatic form and before suffixes; but it disappears in the simple form of the noun, and is represented in writing by an *aleph*. Thus: ܠܐܬܐ, ܠܐܬܐܐ, ܠܐܬܐܐܐ, ܠܐܬܐܐܐܐ.

Here I may be allowed to remark that this original fem. in *t* has been retained in another instance in several of the Semitic languages, viz. as an adverb. Examples are: Hebrew, רַבַּת, Ps. lxx. 10, cxx. 6, cxxiii. 4; Aramaic, מוֹת "fasting," Dan. vi. 19; Syriac, ܠܐܬܐ, ܠܐܬܐܐ, ܠܐܬܐܐܐ "alive," ܠܐܬܐ "well," ܠܐܬܐ "naked," ܠܐܬܐ "gratis, for nothing"; ܠܐܬܐ "last," ܠܐܬܐܐ or ܠܐܬܐܐܐ "first," where *ith* is merely, as Noeldeke has remarked, a weakening of the older *yath*; ܠܐܬܐܐ "carnally," ܠܐܬܐܐܐ "spiritually," from ܠܐܬܐܐ and ܠܐܬܐܐܐ; ܠܐܬܐܐܐ "like a wild

beast," from **בְּשִׁלְיָא**; and hence, in Syriac and the Palestinian dialect, as an adverbial termination, even where an adjective in **אֲ-**, **בְ-**, is not in use, as **בְּשִׁלְיָא** "well," **בְּשִׁלְיָא** "gently," **בְּשִׁלְיָא** "truly." Such adverbs, being really feminine adjectives in the old form of the *status absolutus*, may be construed with a preposition, as **בְּשִׁלְיָא** "in Greek," **בְּשִׁלְיָא** "in Syriac"; and still more freely in Mandaitic, **בְּשִׁלְיָא** "in haste," **בְּשִׁלְיָא** "gently." Sometimes the abstract termination **וֹת** is used in the same way in both languages, as **לְנִתְּוֹת** "a second time, again," **לְנִתְּוֹת** "a third time"; in the dialect of Palestine, **לְנִתְּוֹת** "rightly, well"; in Mandaitic **רַאבְּוֹת** "grandly"; and among the later Jews **יָאוֹת**, **טְבוֹת**.

I may next remark that this fem. in **ת** has in some cases received a curious increment in Mandaitic and the Talmudic dialect. Here namely we find some feminine adjectives ending in **תִּי**, Mand. **תִּיא**, instead of **תָּא**. The correct pronunciation of this termination is held by Noeldeke to be most probably **תִּי**.

With the Hebrew **רַבָּתִי** in Lament. i. 1, **הָעִיר רַבָּתִי עָם**, it can have nothing to do; that form is to be classed with **וְגַבְתִּי יוֹם**, **אֶסְרִי לְגֶפֶן עֵירוֹה**, etc., which I shall try to explain when we speak of the cases. Examples of this fem. in **תִּי** from the Talmud and Targūms are: **אֶצְבָּעִיהָ זוּמְרָתִי** "his little finger," **אֹפְמִתִּי**, **חֲנוּרָתִי**, **מִלְתָּא אַחֲרִיתִי** "the new year," **שְׁתָּא חֲדָתִי**, **הָאֲדִיתִיא** "small," **צַטְאֲרִיתִיא**, **רַבָּתִי** "new," **הוֹרִינְתִיא** "another," **הוֹאֲרִיתִיא** "white," **כֹּאדִירִיתִיא** "heavy," **הַאֲתִיקִיתִיא** "ancient," **שַׁאפִּירִיתִיא** "beautiful," etc.

I would now call your attention to the parallel form in the flexion of the verb, viz. the 3rd pers. sing. fem. of the perfect, in Hebrew **קָטְלָהּ**. Here too the original termination was *at*, as is proved not only by the Arabic **قَتَلَتْ** *qatalat*, the Ethiopic

Ⲫⲧⲏⲧ: *katilat*, and the Syriac ܕܠܝܬ *kēlīth*, but also by the following evidence derived from Hebrew itself. (1) The form with final *t* is actually found in Deut. xxxii. 36, אָזַלְתָּ יָדְךָ (for אָזַלְתָּ), Ezek. xlvi. 17, וְשַׁבְתָּ; possibly too Isaiah xxiii. 15, וְנִשְׁכַּחַת צִרְךָ (for וְנִשְׁכַּחַת); as also in the whole class of verbs so-called, e.g. עָשִׂיתָ for עָשִׂיתָ, הִרְצִיתָ for הִרְצִיתָ, הִגַּלְתָּ for הִגַּלְתָּ. This is exactly the Arabic جَلَّتْ, by contraction for جَلِيَتْ; and the uncontracted גָּלְיָה is actually found once in Hebrew in the pausal חָסְרָה נִפְשִׁי, Ps. lvii. 2, whereas the ordinary pausal form is עָשִׂתָּה. The ordinary non-pausal form עָשִׂתָּה, גָּלְתָּה, etc., is a secondary formation, in which the fem. suffix is repeated in the form הָ, thus aiming at uniformity with the ordinary קָטַלְתָּ. (2) The form with final *t* invariably occurs in connexion with pronominal suffixes; e.g. יִלְדְתִּי; יִלְדְתֶּךָ; בָּאֲתָנוּ; אֲחֻזְתָּה; יִלְדְתוּ, or with assimilation גִּמְלָתְהוּ, גִּמְלָתְהוּ, etc. Into this subject I shall have to enter more fully in treating of the verb; here it must suffice to have thus indicated the identity of the fem. termination in the singular noun and in the 3rd pers. sing. of the perfect tense.

The feminine termination הָ is occasionally written in Hebrew with א in place of ה, according to the usual practice in Aramaic; e.g. חָנָא Isaiah xix. 17, קָרְחָא Ezek. xxvii. 31, שִׁנָּא Ps. cxxvii. 2, מִטְרָא Lament. iii. 12; and even in the verb, גִּבְהָא Ezek. xxxi. 5. We also find the vowel of this syllable weakened, though very rarely, into ם, as in the noun הַזֹּרְחָה for הַזֹּרְחָה, Isaiah lix. 5, and in the verb לָנָה for לָנָה, Zechar. v. 4.

Besides the feminine termination in َ or ِ, the Arabic

language possesses two others, viz. \bar{a} َ ي and $\bar{a}'u$ ُ ي, both, as it would seem, originally of abstract signification. Examples of the former are ^{بشري} "good news," ^{حمي} "a fever," ^{دعوي} "a claim," ^{رويا} "a vision"; of the latter, ^{صحرأ} or ^{بيدأ} "a desert," ^{كبريأ} "glory, pride." The one, viz. \bar{a} َ ي, forms the feminine of adjectives ending in \bar{a} َ ان, as ^{شبعان} "sated, not hungry," f. ^{شبعي}; and of the form ^{افعل} used as a superlative, e. g. ^{الصغري} "the smallest," f. ^{الصغري}. The other, $\bar{a}'u$ ُ ي, forms the feminine of ^{افعل}, when it is not a comparative or superlative, as ^{احمر} "red," ^{احمق} "foolish," ^{حمقأ}. These terminations seem to find their representatives in Ethiopic in nouns ending in \bar{a} , as ^{ሕንፃ}: "building," ^{ፍላጋ}: "joy," ^{ጥላ}: "oath," ^{ዐጥፃ}: "wrong," ^{ጥንፈ}: "temptation," ^{ጸጥ}: or ^{ፃጥ}: "toil," ^{ጸተ}: "order, row"; and in \bar{a} , as ^{ሠርፑ}: "beam, mast," ^{ሰርፑ}: "army," ^{ፃፃ}: "moth," ^{ጊዜ}: "time," ^{ዕድጹ}: "appointed time." The rules of gender are, however, very loosely observed in Ethiopic, and most of the words just cited may also be construed as masculine.

The Arabic termination \bar{a} َ ي is represented in Syriac by the form *ai*, as in ^{ሕኒታ}, ^{ሕኒታ}, ^{ሕኒታ}, ^{ሕኒታ}, ^{ሕኒታ}, and a few more. In Hebrew this termination can hardly be said to exist, unless we reckon as examples of it the proper name ^{שַׁרִי}, of which the later form is ^{שָׂרָה}, and the numeral ^{עשרה}, in the compounds ^{אחת עשרה}, etc., which may stand for an original ^{עשרִי}. Of the other ending $\bar{a}'u$ ُ י I can find at present no certain trace in Aramaic and Hebrew, for Hebrew words in \bar{u} ֹ or \bar{u} ֻ, mostly proper names, seem, without exception, to have lost a final *u*, ^{גלה} and ^{שילה}, for example, form the adjectives ^{גילני} and ^{שילני}. Since, however, in Arabic, we find

صنعاني derived from الصنعا, بهرائي from the name of the tribe بهرائي, روحاني from روحا, it may be that גילה and שילה, as well as the Moabite קרהה, represent an original *Gailâ'u*, *Shailâ'u*, and *Karhâ'u*.

Finally, I may say a few words regarding a curious feminine form in Ethiopic, which consists entirely in an internal change of vowels. This is found in adjectives of the form *katîl*, which take in the feminine *katîl*; e.g. ሐደስ: "new," ሐደስ; ጠቢብ: "learned, wise," ጠቢብ; ዐቢይ: "great," ዐቢይ; ረሀብ: (for *rahîb*) "wide, spacious," ረሀብ; ቀይሽ: (for *kayîḥ*) "red," ቀይሽ. Of this formation Ewald has discovered a trace in Arabic in حَصَان "chaste," applied to a woman, as compared with حَصِين "inaccessible, unapproachable"; and in رَزَان "grave, staid," also used of a woman, whereas the masculine is رَزِين.

II. Numbers and Cases.

In treating of the *Numbers* and *Cases* of nouns in the Semitic languages I shall begin with the latter, for reasons which will become apparent as we proceed.

Of what we are accustomed to call *cases*—those varieties of termination which express the relations to one another of a noun and verb or of two nouns—the Semitic languages possess but three: the *casus rectus*, nominative or subject, and two *casus obliqui*, the one indicating the accusative or direct object, and also serving in a variety of ways as a *casus adverbialis*, the other corresponding most closely to the Indo-European genitive.

In the *singular* number these three cases are distinguished in ancient Arabic, in the great majority of nouns, by three terminations, *ũ* for the subject or nominative, *ũ* for the object or accusative, and *ĩ* for the genitive, as we may appropriately

designate the second oblique form. In certain classes of nouns, however, the accusative has at an early period supplanted the genitive, so that these have only two terminations, *ā* for the nominative, and *ā* for the accusative and genitive. Examples of the triptote declension:—

بَيْتٌ	بَيْتٍ	بَيْتًا
جَنَّةٌ	جَنَّةٍ	جَنَّةًا

The usage of the Arabic restricts these simple terminations to the definite and construct states of the noun. The noun must be defined by the article,

الْبَيْتُ	الْبَيْتِ	الْبَيْتَ;
-----------	-----------	------------

or it must be followed by a genitive, which is also a species of definition,

بَيْتُ يُونُسَ	بَيْتِ يُونُسَ	بَيْتَ يُونُسَ
بَيْتُهُ	بَيْتِهِ	بَيْتَهُ

In no other Semitic language has this inflexion been retained in such fullness and purity as in the ancient Arabic, the Arabic of the prae-Mohammedan poets and of the *Ḳor'ān*. In the modern language, as spoken at the present day, the case-terminations are either confounded with one another or entirely lost. In the Sinaitic peninsula, for example, one hears '*ammuk*',
عَمُّكُ, which is really the nominative, used for all three cases.

In Ethiopic we can distinguish only one of these cases by an external mark; the accusative, with the termination *ā*. The vowel-endings of the nominative and genitive have disappeared; and the accusative *ā* takes the place of the others in the construct state, without any regard to the real case of the governing noun. E.g., ለፍቃረ፡ ብላሳተ፡ "he loved a woman," ነጉሠ፡ ሊትዖጲዖ፡ "the king of Ethiopia." In the case of proper names, the accusative termination is ኃ፡ *hā*, to which

form I shall call your attention more particularly hereafter; e.g. $\Phi P \zeta \Psi$: "Cain," $\text{J} \text{U} \text{L} \text{Y}$: "Judah."

In Assyrian, so far as I can understand the statements of the grammarians, these terminations are, as a general rule, appended to the noun when it is not in the construct state, but apparently without any regard to the actual relation of case. Thus, according to Schrader, the Assyrian writes *ina lisân mât Aḥarri*, "in the language of the country of Phœnicia," without any case-sign in *lisân* and *mât*; *šar Babilu*, "king of Babel"; *maliku bânūsun*, "the king their builder"; *āšib libbišun*, "dwelling in their midst"; *iribu ša šanši* or *irib šanši*, "the setting of the sun"; *Dariyavus šarri*, "Darius the king." Here, therefore, the state of matters seems to be much the same as in modern Arabic; the case-endings, when employed, are used without any strict regard to their proper signification.

In Hebrew traces of all three terminations may be found. The accusative indeed is not uncommon, particularly in its adverbial sense, indicating direction or motion towards. E.g., אַרְצָה "to the ground," בֵּיתָהּ "homewards," "inwards," הַבֵּיתָהּ "into the house," הָעֵינָהּ "to the well," הָרָהּ "uphill," הָהָרָהּ "to the mountains," שֶׁכֶּמָּה "to Shechem," לְשֹׁכֶתָהּ "into a chamber," הַבִּמְצָתָהּ "to the highplace," גִּשְׁן אַרְצָה שָׁבַע , בְּאַרְצָה שָׁבַע , יָמָה סוּף , בֵּיתָהּ יֹסֵף . As real objective accusatives I may cite $\text{הִקְלָ אֶרְצָה וּבָלוֹן וְאַרְצָה נִפְתָּלִי}$ "he abased, etc." Isaiah viii. 23; $\text{מִי פָקַד עָלָיו אֶרְצָה}$ "who hath committed to his charge the earth?" Job xxxiv. 13. Here you may remark that the vowel *a* is expressed in writing by the letter ה. This does not, however, justify us in speaking of a "ה locale," as if the ה were anything more than the mere indication of the final vowel.

The terminations of the nominative and genitive are far rarer, and seem indeed to be used now and then only as archaisms, just as our poets occasionally indulge in such archaisms as *yode*, *whilom*, *yclept*, *ywis*, and the like. We need not therefore expect them to be employed with more regard to

grammatical accuracy than in Assyrian or in modern Arabic. The nominative termination is $\dot{\text{ו}}$, in such phrases as וְחִיתֹ-אָרְצָן Gen. i. 24, בְּנוֹ צֶפֶר Ps. l. 10, לְחִיתֹ-אָרְצָן Ps. lxxix. 2, “O son of Šippôr,” Num. xxiii. 18, $\text{נָאֵם בְּלָעַם בְּנוֹ בְּעֵר}$ Num. xxiv. 3, 15, לְמַעֲנוּ-מִים Ps. cxiv. 8. The purer form $\dot{\text{ו}}$ I can discover only in a few compound nouns, e.g., אֲחוּמִי , פְּנוּיָל , מְתוּשָׁאֵל , and מְתוּשָׁלַח . The genitive termination is ־ , as in מְלֹאֲתִי Lament. i. 1, רַבִּיתִי עִם Ps. cx. 4, $\text{עַל־דְּבַרְתִּי מִלְכִי-צֶדֶק}$ Isaiah i. 21, בְּנֵי אֲחֵנוּ (acc.) Gen. xlix. 11. It appears also in many compound proper names, as גְּבַרְיָאֵל , מְלְכִי-צֶדֶק , עֲזַרְיָאֵל , חֲנַיָּאֵל .

All these three forms, no doubt, existed likewise in the Phœnician language, though the defective orthography of the monuments does not enable us to recognise them. In the inscription of Eshmûn‘azar, for example [C. I. S., No. 3, l. 11, 12], the words לְמַטָּה and לְמַעַל are no doubt to be pronounced לְמַטָּה and לְמַעַלָּה , just as in Hebrew. In other cases the classical writers come to our aid. *Hannibal*, for instance, is חַנְיָבַעַל (genit.), but *Asdrubal* is עֲזֻרֻבַּעַל (nomin.).

In Syriac we look in vain for any trace of these case-endings, save in two or three nouns regarding which I may be allowed to say a few words. I mean the words أَب “father,” أَخ “brother,” and أَخ “father-in-law”; in Arabic, أَب , أَخ , أَخ ; in Hebrew, אָב , אָח , חָם . These have all lost their third radical, which was a א , and which reappears in Arabic in the construct state thus:—

N.	أَبُو	for	أَبُو
G.	أَبِي	for	أَبُو
A.	أَبَا	for	أَبُو

Of these three forms the Ethiopic has preserved before pronominal suffixes the nom. $\lambda\theta\text{:}$, as $\lambda\theta\text{:}\eta$: “thy father,” and the accus. $\lambda\eta\text{:}$, as $\lambda\eta\eta$: “thy father,” though $\lambda\theta\text{:}\eta$ is also used for the accusative. The Hebrew has chosen the genitive for all its three cases, אָבִי “father of —,” אֲבִי ; whereas the Syriac has

preferred the nom., ܐܒܝ , and similarly ܐܒܝܐ and ܐܒܝܐܝܐ .

Let us now return once more to the Arabic, and examine its three flexional forms, \tilde{n} , \tilde{i} , \tilde{a} . What may the origin of these be? With regard to the accusative the answer seems to be tolerably certain. It is a pronominal element, of a demonstrative nature, appended to the object noun to indicate the direction of the action of the governing verb. It is in fact nothing but the demonstrative $h\tilde{a}$, with which we are already acquainted in all the Semitic languages. In Ethiopic the full form ψ is employed, as I already mentioned, to form the accusative of proper names. $\phi\rho\psi\psi$ etc. The gradual weakening of the h gives us such adverbial forms as $\lambda\phi\lambda$: $af'\tilde{a}$, or $\lambda\phi\lambda$: $af'\tilde{a}$, “out, outside” (*forās, foris*), $\eta\psi\omega$: “at all, ever”; but ordinarily the particle is shortened to the utmost, and appears as final \tilde{a} . The Hebrew אֶל preserves somewhat of the original lengthening of the vowel, for a primitive short \tilde{a} would certainly have disappeared *in toto*.

The origin of the nominative \tilde{n} is more obscure; but we may possibly venture to see in it the pronominal element $h\tilde{n}$, as designating the subject. Finally, the genitive \tilde{i} , إِ , may perhaps be connected with the termination of the so-called

relative adjectives in إِ (Arabic إِ , vulgarly يِ), the origin of which is, however, not yet clear to me.

I said at the commencement of this discussion that the use of the singular terminations \tilde{n} , \tilde{i} , \tilde{a} in Arabic was restricted to the defined noun, whether the definition was by the article or by a following genitive. I now remark that the undefined noun is inflected with the same terminations *plus* the sound of n , viz. \tilde{nn} , \tilde{in} , \tilde{an} . E. g.

بَيْتٌ	بَيْتٌ	بَيْتَانِ
جَنَّةٌ	جَنَّةٌ	جَنَّتَانِ

In the accus. form ^{بَيْتًا} the letter *'alif* may perhaps serve to mark the pausal pronunciation, *baitā*, or it may be a mere indication of the *α*-sound, to distinguish this case more clearly in writing from the other two. This addition of the *n*-sound in Arabic is technically called the *tanwīn* or "nunation," from the name of the letter *nūn*.

If we look around us for a similar appearance in the other Semitic languages, we find its counterpart in the *mīnation* of the Assyrian, which is not, however, according to the grammarians, restricted to the undefined noun, but also irregularly used with that which is defined. The forms are usually written *uv*, *iv*, *av*, but as *v* and *m* are not distinguished in writing, we are justified by analogy in pronouncing them *um*, *im*, *am*.

The same *mīnation* is found in the Hīmyaritic inscriptions of South Arabia in the form **ם** for all three cases, its use nearly corresponding with that of the Arabic *nūnation*; e.g., **נַשְׁמַשֵּׁם** : **עֲגֵלָה עֲגֵלְתֵּם**, **כְּלָבָה דִּלְבַתֵּם**; **שִׁאֲנִי שִׁנָּאֵם**, **אֲנִן אֲדָנֵם**, **שִׁמְשֵׁם** :

עֲבֵד שִׁמְשֵׁם ^{עֲבֵד} **עֲבֵד שִׁמְשֵׁם**, but **עֲבֵד שִׁמְשֵׁם**.

In Hebrew the *mīnation* seems to me to present itself in such words as **אֲמָנָם** or **אֲמָנֵם**, **חָנָם**, **רִיקָם**, **יּוֹמָם**, which I consider as the accusatives of **אֲמָן** and **חֵן** and **רִיק**. **יּוֹמָם** is doubtful, as it may be connected with **יּוֹמָם** rather than with **יּוֹם**. In Ethiopic we may perhaps find a trace of it in the word **ተገጥሞ**, Heb. **אֶתְמוֹל**, **תְּמוֹל**.

Now what is the origin of these terminations *un*, *in*, *an*. and *um*, *im*, *am*? And are they identical, or different? These questions are hard to answer; but I incline on the whole to consider them as identical, and to derive them both from an appended, indefinite **מָה**, **מָה**. That *n* and *m* readily interchange is known to us; and it is quite conceivable that some of the Semitic languages may have substituted *n* for original *m* in certain grammatical forms, whilst others carried out the change through the whole of them. That the word **מָה**, **מָה** might have been used at

an early period in the way suggested, can only be inferred from the recurrence of the phenomenon at a later period. History is apt to repeat itself, especially linguistic history. Now we find this use of *ma* as an indefinite affix in Arabic in the so-called *حما* *حما*, i. e. *ma* appended to an indefinite noun with a vague, often intensifying, force: e. g., *أَعْطَا كِتَابًا مَّا* "give us some book (or other)"; *قَلِيلٌ مَّا* "some (small) quantity"; *جِئْتُ لَأَمْرٍ مَّا* "thou art come for some matter (of importance)." Similar is the origin of the Aramaic word *מִיָּדִי, מִנְדָּא, מְדַעַם*, a contraction of *מִדַּע מָה* "scibile quid." For the rest, how readily *ma* may be shortened into *mā* and *m* appears from such Arabic forms as *كَمْ* "how much?" *لَمْ, بِمَ, حَتَّى مَ, عَلَي مَ* shortened into *لَمْ, بِمَ*.

We have thus far established the following scheme of inflexion by cases in the Semitic languages for the *singular* number.

	Arabic	Assyr., Hīmyar., Hebrew
N.	<i>u, un</i>	<i>u, um</i>
G.	<i>i, in</i>	<i>i, im</i>
Acc.	<i>a, an</i>	<i>a, am</i>

Let us next examine the formation of the *plural*.

To express the idea of plurality in the inflexion of the noun the Semitic languages had recourse to the simple expedient of lengthening the vowel-ending of the singular. The lengthening of the sound, the dwelling upon the utterance, sufficed to convey the idea of indefinite number. Consequently in Arabic the undefined plural of masculine nouns must originally have been—

N. *ân*, G. *în*, Acc. *ân*.

But as the Arabs seem to have objected to terminate a long syllable with a consonant (save in pause), a short final vowel was added, giving the forms—

N. *âna*, G. *îna*, Acc. *âna*.

These forms were also employed in the plural when defined by the article; but in the construct state, as we should naturally expect, the final vowels of the singular were merely lengthened—

N. *â*, G. *î*, Acc. *â*.

In the actual language, however, as known to us from the old poets and the *Kor'an*, the accusative *â*, *âna*, has become obsolete, so that we have in real use only two cases—

N. *â*, *âna*; G. Acc. *î*, *îna*.

The vulgar dialects of the present day have gone yet one step farther, and have discarded the nominative from ordinary use, retaining only the form *în*. In Ethiopic, on the contrary, the accusative *ân* has supplanted the other cases, and forms the ordinary plural of adjectives and participles; as *ሕይወት*: “alive,” “living,” *ሕይወት፡፡* *ሐደስ*: “new,” *ሐደሰት፡፡* *ክሠተ*: “revealed,” “manifest,” *ክሠተት፡፡* Forgetful however of the real origin of this form, the language forms for itself an accusative and a construct state by appending to it the vowel *â*, as in the singular; and the real construct plural in *â* is found only in the numerals for 20, 30, etc., which are *ዕለሠ፡* *ሠላሳ፡* *እርብዓ፡* *ኀሙሳ፡* etc. In all this the Assyrian runs curiously parallel to the Ethiopic. According to Schrader, the plural in *ân* appears in the forms *ânû*, *ânî*, *âna*, with an appended vowel (obviously borrowed from the singular); as *šalmânû*, “statues” (*صَلَمَ. صُلَمَ*): *ḥursâni*, “woods” (*חֹרֶשׁ*); *šûrânî*, “walls” (*שׁוּר*); *šarrânî*, “princes” (*שָׂר*); whilst the numerals, 20, 30, etc., are *‘iśrâ*, *šilašâ*, *irbâ*, *ḥanšâ*.

The Aramaic dialects make use, not of the accusative, but of the other oblique form, the genitive, for their plural. Hence we find the forms *î* in the Biblical Aramaic, *î* in Syriac, and in Mandaitic both *î* and *î* (*î*).

The same choice was made by the Hebrews and Phoenicians. They discarded both the nom. *âm* and the accus. *âm*, retaining only the gen. *îm* in ordinary use¹. In later stages of the language the *m* was dropped, a form of which there are two or three doubtful examples in the Bible; but curiously enough

¹ But the Moabites took the form *î*, e.g., *המלכן שת*, *גברן*, *ארבען שת*, *חמט היערן*, etc.

this form in *î* is said to be not uncommon in Assyrian, as in *ilî*, "gods"; *malkî* or *malikî*, "kings"; *âmî*, "days"; *pagrî*, "dead bodies"; with suffixes *karḥîšu* "its towers"; *ašri-šunu*, "their places." The full form in *îm* is rare and archaistic, as in the proper names *Ašur-rîš-ilîm*, *Sumîrîm* and *Akkadîm*. Haupt finds traces of the form *ām*, representing the old accusative, in the Assyrian *šamāmu*, *šamāmi*, "heaven," *māmi*, "water," and the adverbial *akhāmîš*, "with one another, mutually (*lit.* like brothers)." It seems probable, as he suggests, that the plural *ān* is only a later form of this *ām*. And indeed he goes so far as to deny the existence of the termination *i*, which he pronounces *ē*, and considers to be only a deflection of *ā*, from *ān*, *ām*.

You must not suppose that there is anything singular in this apparently capricious choice of a single case-ending to take the place of all its fellows, in the later stages of a language. It is precisely what has happened elsewhere than on Semitic ground. I need hardly remind you that Greek nouns appear in Syriac mostly in the *accusative*, simply because that was the one form with which the Syrians were familiar in the mouths of the Greeks; e.g. ܠܡܢܐܕܐ (*lampáda*), ܠܟܝܪܕܐ (*kerkída*), ܠܒܢܝܐܢܐ (*ándriánta*), ܠܐܪܚܐ (*árchás*), etc. The Latin *accusative* too has supplied the ordinary nominal forms of the different Romance languages. In modern Persian the plural ان *ân* is regarded by the best authorities as derived from an ancient *genitive* in *ām* (*aîm*).

Turning to the plural of *feminine* nouns, we find the same principle in force, only applied in a different way. The weight of utterance was thrown in this case not upon the case-endings, but upon the feminine termination *ât*, which accordingly became *ât*, and took the case-endings as the singular.

Sing.	N.	<i>atu, atun</i>	Plur.	<i>âtû, âtun</i>
	G.	<i>atî, atîn</i>		<i>âtî, âtîn</i>
	Ac.	<i>ata, atan</i>		<i>âta, âtan.</i>

In Arabic these forms are all in common use, except the accusative plural, which has disappeared even in the oldest stages of the language. The Ethiopic has *ât*, with its accusative and construct *âta*. In Aramaic we find, as we should naturally

expect, the termination תְּ , אֵ , âth , ôth ; in Hebrew, with the usual vowel-change, תִּ , which sinks in the later Phœnician into ûth , as in Plautus's *yth alonim valonuth*. In Assyrian âtu , âti , âta , are common; but there is also (if the grammarians may be trusted) a termination ût , corresponding perhaps to the Hebrew and Phœnician ôth , ûth ; and a third form in ît (or as Haupt pronounces it ēt), restricted to such words as have already weakened at into it in the singular. E.g., *ina šanâti dannâti*, "in long (*lit.* strong) years"; *tabbanûtu*, "buildings," from *tabbanu*; *ibšîti*, "deeds," from *ibšit* (עבשית), according to Haupt *ēpšētî*; *išrîti* (*îšrēti*) "temples."

Of the so-called *broken plurals* of the Arabic I cannot speak at any length in this place. You will find these various forms enumerated in any Arabic Grammar, and many of them occur likewise in Hîmyaritic and Ethiopic. In the northern dialects examples are either wanting or of rare occurrence. Böttcher has endeavoured to point out several in Hebrew; see his *Ausführliches Lehrbuch*, vol. i. p. 458-9. In Syriac we may perhaps refer to this class such words as ܩܪܝܐ from ܩܪܝܐ (Arabic قَرِيَّة , plur. قَرِيَّ), and ܕܡܢܐ from ܕܡܢܐ (Arabic حِمَار , plur. حِمَر). These so-called broken plurals are, however, in all probability without exception, singular abstract forms, which gradually came to be used in a concrete and collective sense, and hence pass for plurals. We are told, for example, that نَصْر is a plural of نَاصِر , "helper," or عَدْل of عَادِل , "just"; but in reality these are nothing but the infinitives of نَصْر and عَدْل , meaning "help," and "justice," and may be applied alike to one or more, man or woman; for we can say رَجُلٌ عَدْل , أَمْرَأَةٌ عَدْل , and قَوْمٌ عَدْل . Another plural of قَاتِل , viz. قَاتِلَات , is an example of the same sort, being really an intensive infinitive, to be compared with the Syriac ܩܬܠܐ , ܩܬܠܐ , ܩܬܠܐ , etc.

In addition to the singular and plural, the Semitic languages

employed from their earliest period a third form to designate a pair or two of any objects. The principle of formation of this *dual* would naturally resemble that of the plural; that is to say, the vowel of the singular would be lengthened in some way, so as to indicate the increase of number. But as the simple lengthening was appropriated to the plural, in the case of the dual recourse was had to the heightening of the singular terminations by the insertion of a short *ā*. Hence result the forms—

N. $\check{a} + \check{u}n = aun$

G. $\check{a} + \check{i}n = ain$

Ac. $\check{a} + \check{a}n = \hat{a}n$.

For the same reason as in the plural, the Arabs added here also a final vowel; but on account of the greater weight of the dual endings, or perhaps merely for the sake of variety, they selected in this case the weaker vowel *ġ*; whence the forms

N. *auni*

G. *aini*

Ac. *āni*.

These forms were used, like the corresponding plurals, when the noun was defined by the article; but in the construct state the syllable *ni* is of course absent, and we have merely the vowel-endings

N. *au*

G. *ai*

Ac. *ā*.

Of these terminations the nominative must have fallen into disuse at a very early period, and its place was usurped by the accus.; so that we actually meet in Arabic only the two forms

N. *ā, āni*

G. Ac. *ai, aini*.

In modern Arabic the first of these has now disappeared from ordinary use, leaving only the form *ain, en*, for all the cases. In S. Arabian or Himyaritic the termination is also ׀, as צלמן ואבלנהן (acc.), ולביתנהן “and their two houses (castles),” מאתן אסדס “two hundred warriors” (nom.), צמלנהן “these two statues” (acc.). In Ethiopic scarcely a trace of the dual can be detected. In Assyrian Schrader gives as examples *idā*, “two hands”; *uznā*, “two ears”; *šipa-ai* (for *šipā-ya*), “my feet”; *birka-ai*, “my knees”; *ḫata-ai*, “my hands.” Here the final *n* seems to have been cast off, according to the analogy of the plural in *ī* for *īm*.

The Aramaic form is $\text{ין} \text{—}$, with slight supplemental vowel, for $\text{ין} \text{—}$ *ain*, corresponding to the ordinary Arabic oblique form $\text{ين} \text{—}$. This was contracted into $\text{ין} \text{—}$, as in מֵאָתָן for מֵאָתַיִן , “two hundred”; or into $\text{ין} \text{—}$, as in תֵּרִין for תֵּרַיִן , “two.” In Syriac it survives in only two or three words, in the form *én*, viz. ܐܢܝܢ , f. ܐܢܝܢܐ , ܐܢܝܢܐ , and ܡܠܝܢܐ ; further weakened into *in*, in ܡܫܝܢܐ , “Mesopotamia,” ܡܫܝܢܐ (1 Kings xviii. 32), Heb. $\text{בְּבֵית סְאֲתִים וָרַע}$, and even $\text{אֶתְּךָ} =$ יָדַיִם , אֶפְיִם ; just as in Latin the sole representatives of the dual are the words *ambo*, *duo*, and *octo*. The Hebrew form is $\text{ים} \text{—}$, for $\text{ים} \text{—}$ *aim*, with *m* for *n*, as in the plural; e.g., יָמִים , אֲלָפִים , מֵאָתַיִם , כַּפְּרַיִם , שְׁנַתַּיִם , and often in proper names, as $\text{בֵּית דְּבִלְתַּיִם}$, עֵין עַגְלַיִם , קְרִיתַיִם , חֲרָנַיִם , חֲפָרַיִם , הָעֵינַיִם . Rarer forms are the contracted $\text{ם} \text{—}$, as הָעֵינָם (Josh. xv. 34), קְרִיתָמָה (Ezek. xxv. 9, *kethlbbh*); and $\text{ים} \text{—}$ in שְׁנַיִם עֶשְׂרֵה , f. עֶשְׂרֵה . Further, $\text{ין} \text{—}$, contracted $\text{ין} \text{—}$; e.g. דִּתֵּן , דִּתֵּן , and קִרְתֵּן (Josh. xxi. 32). On the Moabite stone both forms appear, ם and ין ; e.g., הַצְהָרִים (הַצְהָרִים), l. 15, but מֵאָתָן , בֵּית דְּבִלְתָּן , קְרִיתָן , חֲרָנָן .

And here I may intercalate the remark that the words מַיִם and שָׁמַיִם are not duals, but plurals, from obsolete singulars מַי and שָׁמַי . The original forms must have been *maym* and *shamaym*, which were contracted into *maym* and *shamaym*, just as in Arabic مَوِيَّت , لَيْلِيْن , and هَوِيْن , gradually pass into مَيِّت , لَيْلِيْن , and هَيْن . But since forms like *maym* and *shamaym* were intolerable to the ear of the later Hebrews, a short vowel was inserted to lighten the pronunciation, resulting

in the forms מִים and שְׁמִים, the latter of which was pronounced in Phœnician *shamem*, as in Plautus's *gunc balsamem*, i.e., גִּאֲוֹנִי בַעַל שְׁמִים.

I shall conclude this survey of the declension of the noun with a few remarks on some forms which we have not as yet noticed.

(1) The construct state of the dual and plural in Hebrew and Aramaic, viz., יְ, יָ.

In Arabic the forms of the dual in actual use are, as we have seen,

Simple, N. <i>āni</i> ,	Construct, <i>ā</i>
G. Ac. <i>aini</i>	<i>ai</i>

and of the plural,

Simple, N. <i>āna</i>	Construct, <i>ā</i>
G. Ac. <i>ina</i>	<i>ī</i>

In Assyrian in like manner the construct dual ended in *ā*, as *birka-ai* (for *birkā-ya*), "my knees"; the plural in *ī* [or *ī*], as *šarrī-šunu*, "their kings." Consequently we should expect the Hebrew and Aramaic dual to have the construct form *ai*, *ē*, but the plural in both languages *ī*; יְדֵיהֶם, יְדָיָם, from יְדִים, יְדָיָם; but from מַלְכֵיהֶם, מַלְכָּיָם, we should look for מַלְכֵיהֶם, מַלְכָּיָם, which however do not exist. The actually existing forms are מַלְכֵיהֶם, מַלְכָּיָם; and these can, I think, be explained only on the supposition that the dual forms have supplanted those of the plural number. I find additional evidence for this notion in the forms מַלְכָּיָם, מַלְכָּיָם, "my kings," for *malakai-ya*, corresponding with יְדֵי, "my hands," for *yadai-ya*; and מַלְכָּיָם, מַלְכָּיָם, "his kings," corresponding with יְדָיָם, standing for *malakai-hū*, *yadai-hū*, and *malakau-hū*, *yadau-hū*, in which latter I descry a vestige of the long obsolete nominative dual in *aun*, construct *au*.

(2) The form ܐܢܝܢ , ܐܢܝܢ , used as the simple plural of feminine nouns in Aramaic; e.g., ܡܚܬܝܢܝܢ , ܩܕܝܫܝܢܝܢ , as contrasted with the construct ܡܚܬܝܢܝܢ , ܩܕܝܫܝܢܝܢ , which correspond with the Arabic plural in *ât* and the Hebrew in *ôth*. This form in *ân*, *ôn*, which also plays an important rôle in the verbal inflection, I regard as a variation of the masculine *ân*, under the influence of the ordinary fem. *ât*. The language felt the want of an additional feminine termination in the plural, and framed it from existing material after the analogy of an established form.

(3) The so-called *status emphaticus* of the Aramaic; ܐܢܝܢ "the man," ܡܕܝܢܝܢܝܢ "the city," ܡܕܝܢܝܢܝܢ . The essence of this form is the postposition of a demonstrative particle. The Swedes and Danes say *mand-en*, "the man," *hus-et*, "the house," where *en* and *et* are corruptions of *inn* or *hinn* and *itt* or *hitt*. And just so the Aramean added to his noun in its simplest form the demonstrative *hû*, gradually weakened into *â*. $\text{ܐܢܝܢ} + \text{ܐܢܝܢ}$ became $\text{ܐܢܝܢ} + \text{ܐܢܝܢ}$; $\text{ܡܕܝܢܝܢܝܢ} + \text{ܐܢܝܢ}$. Other forms underwent greater alteration. $\text{ܡܕܝܢܝܢܝܢ} + \text{ܐܢܝܢ}$ was contracted into ܡܕܝܢܝܢܝܢ (instead of ܡܕܝܢܝܢܝܢ). ܐܢܝܢ , on the other hand, is another example of the transference of a dual form to the plural, since it arises by assimilation from $\text{ܐܢܝܢ} - \text{ܐܢܝܢ}$. In Syriac and Mandaitic the termination ܐܢܝܢ is shortened into ܐܢܝܢ , ܐܢܝܢ (*î*), though the full form is retained in some cases; for example, in Syriac, in the plural of many words derived from radicals ܐܢܝܢ , and in a few other instances, such as ܐܢܝܢ , "thousands." This contraction naturally commenced with a weakening of the final syllable into *î*, as in ܐܢܝܢ for ܐܢܝܢ , ܐܢܝܢ as interjection for ܐܢܝܢ , and the like.

Having thus treated briefly of the personal pronouns and of the noun, I must next speak of the pronouns as they appear when appended to nouns substantive in the form of genitive

suffixes. In doing so I shall confine myself chiefly to Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic, as represented by Biblical Aramaic, the Targūms and the old Syriac.

In classical Arabic these suffixes are appended to the different cases of the noun in the construct form, i. e. without the tanwīn or nūnātion. E. g.

2. كِتَابُكَ f. كِتَابِكَ, "thy book" (nom.)

كِتَابَكَ f. كِتَابَكَ, "thy book" (acc.)

كِتَابِكَ f. كِتَابِكَ, "of thy book" (gen.)

3. كِتَابُهَا f. كِتَابِهَا, "his, her book" (nom.)

كِتَابَهَا f. كِتَابِهَا, "his, her book" (acc.)

كِتَابِهَا f. كِتَابِهَا, "of his, her book" (gen.)

and so on. Only the suffix of the 1st pers. sing. absorbs the vowels of the case-endings, so that "my book," "of my book," is كِتَابِي or كِتَابِي in all the three cases.

The forms of the spoken Arabic of the present day are such as we should naturally expect, when we take into account the loss of the case-terminations and other final vowels. "My book" is كِتَابِي, "my father" أَبِي or أَبَوِي; "thy father" is أَبُوكَ, fem.

أَبُوكِي or أَبُوكِ. But the final vowel of the fem. pronoun also disappears in most cases, and the difference of gender is marked by a transposition, as it were, of the final vowels; instead of كِتَابُكَ and كِتَابِكَ we have كِتَابُكَ *kitābak* and كِتَابِكَ *kitābik*.

The 3rd pers. sing. masc. is properly كِتَابُهُ *kitāb-hu*, but this is almost always written and pronounced كِتَابُهُ *kitābuh* or *kitāboh*,

or else ^{كِتَابُ} *kitābō*. The fem. is ^{كِتَابُهَا} *kitāb-hā*, more commonly with shortening of the vowel, *kitab-hā*. From ^{أَب} the corresponding forms would be ^{أَبُوهُ} *abūh* and ^{أَبُوهَا} *abū-hā*. The plurals are ^{كِتَابُكُمْ} and ^{كِتَابُهُمْ}; the fem. forms ^{كِتَابِكُنَّ} and ^{كِتَابُهُنَّ} being very rarely used. The long vowel is either shortened in pronunciation, *kitab-nā*, *kitab-hum*, or a slight vowel (*shēvā*) is interposed, *kitābūkum*. Should the noun end in two consonants, as ^{عَبْدٌ} 'abd, this *shēvā* is necessarily inserted, 'abdāhā or 'abdīhā, 'abdūkum, 'abdūhum, 'abdīnā.

Let us now take a Hebrew and Aramaic noun with its suffixes, and examine them by the light we receive from the Arabic, ancient and modern. For example, ^{מֶלֶךְ}, corresponding to the Arabic ^{مَلِكٌ}, ^{مَلِكٌ}, and the Aramaic ^{מַלְכָּא}.

1st pers. sing. in old Arabic ^{مَلِكِي} or ^{مَلِكِي}, vulg. ^{مَلِكِي}; Hebrew ^{מֶלֶךְ}; Chald. also ^{מֶלֶךְ}, Syr. ^{مَلِكِي}, dropping the final vowel.

2nd pers. sing. masc. Arabic ^{مَلِكْكَ}, vulg. ^{مَلِكْكَ}. The Hebrew form is ^{מֶלֶךְ}, in pause ^{מֶלֶךְ}, with a trace of the original case-endings in the moveable *shēvā* and the *sēgōl*. The Aramaic forms are, Chald. ^{מֶלֶךְ}, Syr. ^{مَلِكْكَ}, with long *ā*, *ē*, whereas we should have expected *a* short. Probably *mal-kākh* stands for *malkā-ākh*, and that for *malka-ka*, the old accusative with suffix.

2nd pers. sing. fem. Arabic ^{مَلِكْكِ}, vulg. ^{مَلِكْكِ}. In Hebrew the usual form is ^{מֶלֶךְ}, e.g. ^{מֶלֶךְ}, which may be either merely tone-lengthening of *malk-ik*, or may spring from the coalition of

the two vowels in *malkā-ik*. In Aramaic two forms are found, ܡܠܟܝ and ܡܠܟܝܐ. The Syrian writes ܡܠܟܝܐ, but does not pronounce the final *ī*. The *ē* in these forms is apparently tone-lengthening of the old genitive termination, *maliki-ki*, which must have received the accent, like the corresponding Ethiopic forms *nəgrūsā-kī*, acc. *nəgrūsā-kī*. Hebrew parallels are רַעְיָתִי, Jerem. xi. 15; עוֹנֵכִי, Ps. ciii. 3.

3rd pers. sing. masc. Ar. ܡܠܟܐ, gen. ܡܠܟܐ; vulg. ܡܠܟܐ. The Hebrew forms very nearly resemble those of the vulgar Arabic, viz. ܡܠܟܐ, generally ܡܠܟܐ. These seem to find their origin in the old accus. *malka-hu*, with elision of the *h*, *malka-u*. Quite different is the Aramaic ܡܠܟܐ, as in ܡܠܟܐ, which I trace to the ancient genitive *malki-hu* or *malki-hi*. Parallel forms to this in Hebrew are לְמִינֵהוּ, Gen. i. 21; אֲוִרֵהוּ, Job xxv. 3. Instead of ܡܠܟܐ we occasionally find in Aramaic ܡܠܟܐ, the *h* having apparently become silent; and this form appears in the Phoen. suffix ܡܠܟܐ, more commonly written ܡܠܟܐ, as in ܡܠܟܐ and ܡܠܟܐ. Hebrew forms like אַבְיָו (*abhīu*), פִּיּו (*pīu*), also spring from the old genitive, with elision of the *h*, for אַבְיָהוּ, פִּיָּהוּ, which likewise occur.

3rd pers. sing. fem. Ar. ܡܠܟܐ, vulg. ܡܠܟܐ. In Hebrew we have ܡܠܟܐ, as in אַבְיָה, but more commonly ܡܠܟܐ, agreeing with the Aramaic ܡܠܟܐ (ܡܠܟܐ = ܡܠܟܐ), as in ܡܠܟܐ, ܡܠܟܐ, which we may derive from *malkā-āh*, for *malkā-hā*.

1st pers. plur. Ar. ܡܠܟܐ, vulg. ܡܠܟܐ. In Hebrew ܡܠܟܐ, from the old genitive *malki-nū*. The rare forms with ܡܠܟܐ, such as ܡܠܟܐ "our adversary," Job xxii. 20, ܡܠܟܐ, Ruth iii. 2, may perhaps represent the old accus. *malka-nu*. They stand

therefore nearer to the Aramaic נָא־נָא, ⁷ , as מְלִכְנָא (?), מֻלְכָּ. The Jewish Aramaic form has a tone-long vowel in the penult owing to the accent, (as in the Ethiopic *uḡḡsá-na*). The Syriac has lost the final vowel of the pronoun, under the influence of the same accentuation (compare חֲבִי for חֲבִיָּא, חֲבִיָּא אָבִי).

2nd pers. plur. masc. Ar. مَلِكُكُمْ, vulg. مَلِكُكُمْ. Hebr. מְלִכְכֶּם, probably from the old accus. *malka-kum*; Aramaic similarly מְלִכְכֶּם, with a purer form of the suffix.

2nd pers. plur. fem. Ar. مَلِكُنَّكُمْ, vulg. مَلِكُنَّكُمْ. Hebr. מְלִכְכֶּנּוּ, Aram. מְלִכְכֶּנּוּ, probably from the old accus. *malka-kunna*.

3rd pers. plur. masc. Ar. مَلِكُهُمْ, مَلِكُهُمْ; vulg. مَلِكُهُمْ. In Hebrew the simplest form of the suffix is *hem* for *hum*, as in אֲבִיהֶם, פִּיהֶם, really old genitives. Most of the forms in use, however, are to be explained from an old accus., such as I descry in the rare form בָּלָהֶם, 2 Sam. xxiii. 6, in pause for *kulla-hēm*; whence, by elision of the *h* and contraction, arises the common בָּלָם. A still fuller form is represented by the suffixes מִיָּמוֹ, מִיָּמוֹ, as in חֲלָבָם, עֲזָמוֹ, פְּרִיָּמוֹ, פִּיָּמוֹ, contracted from *hēlba-hēmū*, etc. מְלִכְכֶּם stands therefore for original *malka-humu*. The Aramaic forms need no further explanation, מְלִכְכֶּם, etc.

3rd pers. plur. fem. Ar. مَلِكُنَّهُمْ, مَلِكُنَّهُمْ, vulg. مَلِكُنَّهُمْ. Here again the oldest Hebrew form is the rare הִנָּה; as in לְכָל־הִנָּה, 1 Kings vii. 37, בְּתוֹכָהֶנָּה, Ezek. xvi. 53, for *kulla-hēnna* and

tôkha-henna. Contracted from this are the forms in נָחָה[־] and נָחָה[־], as לְחַתְּנָה, בְּחַתְּנָה, בְּחַתְּנָה, לְחַתְּנָה. Still shorter is the common חָן, as in לְחַתְּנָה, חַלְבָּה, and חָן, as in לְחַתְּנָה. The successive Hebrew forms appear then to have been *malka-henna*, *malka-hēn*, contracted *malkāl'na*, *malkána*, *malkán*. The Aramaic form מַלְכָּאִי calls for no further remark.

In the dual number the Arabic appends the suffixes to the construct forms in *ā* and *ai*; in the plural, to those in *ū* and *i*; as

Dual nom. عِبْدَايَ "my two servants," عِبْدَاكَ, etc.

gen. عِبْدِيَّ, عِبْدَيْكَ, etc.

Plur. nom. بَنُوهُ "his sons," بَنُوكَ, etc.

gen. بَنِيَّ, بَنِيكَ, etc.

But "my sons" is expressed by بَنِيَّ for both nom. بَنُوِي and

gen. بَنِيَّ. In Hebrew and Aramaic this difference between

the dual and plur. has disappeared; because, as it seems to me, the dual terminations in the suffixes have wholly supplanted the plural. The Assyrian said *šipa-ai* "my two feet" [Del. *špāa*], *birka-ai* "my knees," *kata-ai*, "my hands," for *šipā-ya*, *birkā-ya*,

kātā-ya, just as the Arab said رِجْلَايَ, رِجْلَايَ; but the

Assyrian had also the plural forms *šarrī-šunu* [*šarrē-šunu*], "their kings," *ašrī-šunu* [*ašrē-šunu*], "their places." The Hebrew on the other hand used only one form for both numbers. יָדַיִם for

yadaim (Arab. يَدَيْنِ, vulg. يَدَيْنِ) would naturally give in the

construct form *yadai* (Ar. يَدَيَّ), which became יָדַי; but קְטִילִים

for *kātīlīm* (Ar. قَاتِلِينَ, vulg. قَاتِلِينَ) should equally yield קְטִילִי

= Ar. *قَاتِلِي*. As a matter of fact, however, it is not so. The forms in use are *מַלְכִי*, *קוֹמְלִי*, which I maintain to be strictly speaking duals, standing for *ḥāṭilai* and *malakai*. Herewith all the forms of the Hebrew and Aramaic become intelligible.

1st pers. sing. Arab. *مَلِكِي*, *يَدِي*. Heb. *מַלְכִי*, *יְדִי* stand for *yadai-ya* and *malakai-ya*; but the language has dropped the final vowel, and with it the doubling of the final *y*. Similarly in Aramaic, *מַלְכִי*, *מַלְכִי*.

2nd pers. sing. Arab. *مَلِكِيكَ*, *يَدِيكَ*. Heb. *יְדִיךָ* and *יְדִיךָ* for *yadai-ka* and *yadai-ki*, shortened *yadai-k*, *מַלְכִיךָ* for *malakai-ka*. The fuller form of the fem. also occurs, e.g. *חַיִּיכִי* and *נְעוּרִיכִי* in Ps. ciii., for *חַיִּיךָ* and *נְעוּרִיךָ*. This leads us to the Syriac forms *ܡܠܟܝܟܐ* and *ܡܠܟܝܟܐ*, with silent *yūd*. In Biblical Aramaic the diphthong has been weakened into *ā*, just as in Hebrew *אֵין* became *אָן*, or in Aramaic itself *מֵאתַן* became *מֵאתָן*. Hence the masc. *מַלְכִיךָ* for *malkai-ka*, is according to the *k'rē* to be pronounced *מַלְכֶךָ*; whereas the fem. is usually pointed *מַלְכִיךָ* [in the Targums], though *מַלְכֶךָ* is also found.

3rd pers. sing. masc. Arab. *مَلِكِيهِ*, *يَدِيهِ* (for *ه*). In Hebrew the fullest form is *יְדֵיהֶוָה*, *יְדֵיהֶוָה*, *נְבוּרֵיהֶוָה*, for *yadai-hu*, etc., with weakening of *ai* to *ē*. The more common form, however, is *יְדֵיו*, *מַלְכֵיו*, with elision of the *h* and weakening of *ai* to *ā*. We also find a form without *yūd*, as *יְדֵבְרוּ*; and the question arises whether this is identical with *יְדֵבְרוּ*, or not. If identical, then *יְדֵבְרוּ* is only incorrectly written, according to *car*, for *יְדֵבְרוּ*. But it may also be that *יְדֵבְרוּ* stands for the old nomi-

native dual דַּבְּרוּהִי *dabarau-hu*, by elision of the *h*, *dabarau-u*, and then *dabarau*, דַּבְּרוּ; just as the 1st pers. *dabarai-ya* became *dabarai*, דַּבְּרִי. Such at any rate must be the origin of the Aramaic forms מַלְכוּהִי, מַלְכָּהֶסֶב, the latter with silent סֶב, for *malkau-hu*. The form מַלְכוּי, with elision of the ה, also occurs: and this appears to be the Phoenician form in such phrases as בַּעֲנַל אִשׁ קֶרְנִי לִם, בְּשָׁמַע כָּל-דַּבְּרִי, though we may perhaps also read קֶרְנִי and דַּבְּרִי, in closer accordance with the Hebrew forms.

3rd sing. fem. Arab. يَدَيَا مَلَكِيَا; Heb. מַלְכִּיָּה, יְדִיָּה, for *yadai-hā*, *malakai-hā*. The corresponding Aramaic forms are, מַלְכָּהִי (rarely מַלְכִּיָּה), Biblical, מַלְכִּיָּה, *k'rē* מַלְכָּה; Syriac مَلَكَايَا, both standing for *malkai-hā*.

1st pers. plur. Arab. يَدَيْنَا مَلَكَيْنَا. Heb. מַלְכֵינוּ, יְדֵינוּ, for *yadai-nū*, *malakai-nū*. Aramaic, מַלְכֵינָא (*k'rē* מַלְכֵנָא), מַלְכֵנָא, for *malkai-nā*.

2nd pers. plur. masc. Arab. يَدَيْكُم مَلَكَيْكُم. Heb. יְדֵיכֶם, מַלְכֵיכֶם, for *yadai-kum*, *malakai-kum*. Aramaic, מַלְכֵיכֶם, מַלְכֵיכֶם. —The corresponding fem. forms are: Arab. يَدَيْكِ, Heb. יְדֵיךָ, Aram. מַלְכֵיכֶם. The fuller form כְּנָה is found in Hebrew in Ezekiel xiii. 20, כְּסִתֹּתֶיךָ כְּנָה ("pillows").

3rd pers. plur. masc. Arab. يَدَيْهِمْ مَلَكَيْهِمْ, shortened from يَدَايِهِمْ مَلَكَايِهِمْ. In Hebrew the oldest form was of course *yadai-humū*, *malakai-humū*. Hence, on the one hand, the ordinary

שְׁנֵימוֹ, מְלֻכֵּיהֶם, יְרִיחָם; and, on the other, the more poetic אֱלִיהֶֿמָּה, זְבַחֵימוֹ. Archaistic is the form in Ezekiel xl. 16, אֵיל־ from אֵיל as an architectural term. The Aramaic forms are מְלֻכֵּיהֶן, מְצַצְטֻסָּה.—The corresponding *fem.* is in Arab. مَلِكِيَّهِنَّ, مَلِكِيَّهِنَّ, مَلِكِيَّهِنَّ; Heb. יְרִיחָן, מְלֻכֵּיהֶן; Aram. מְצַצְטֻסָּה, מְלֻכֵּיהֶן. Ezekiel indulges in the archaistic form גְּוִיתֵיהֶנָּה, ch. i. 11.

As to the forms of feminine nouns with pronominal suffixes, I would merely call your attention at this time to one point in which Hebrew differs most markedly from Arabic and Syriac. The Arab adds the simple suffixes to the plural substantive, for example, جَنَاتِهِمْ, جَنَاتِهَا, جَنَاتِكَ, جَنَاتِي. So also the Syrian: مְצַצְטֻסָּה, מְצַצְטֻסָּה, מְצַצְטֻסָּה, מְצַצְטֻסָּה. But the Hebrew almost invariably employs what is really an incorrect form. He does not say חֲקֻתֵי, חֲקֻתֶיךָ, חֲקֻתֵי, etc., but he adds to the plural חֲקֻתֵי the dual termination ם, borrowed from the masc., before appending the suffixes, and thus obtains the forms חֲקֻתֵי, חֲקֻתֵיךָ, חֲקֻתֵי. Almost the only exception is in the forms of the 3rd pers. plur., where we find חֲקֻתֵי as well as חֲקֻתֵי.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE VERB.

I NEXT proceed to treat of the *Verb*, in doing which I must direct your attention first, for reasons which will gradually become apparent, to certain *nominal* forms, partly adjectives and partly substantives.

Among the commonest nominal forms in the Semitic languages are those which I may represent by the types *ḵatal*, *ḵatil* and *ḵatul*, especially as concrete substantives and as adjectives. It is in the latter function that we notice them here.

Examples of the form *ḵatal* in Arabic are تَبَعَ "following," "a follower," بَطَلَ "brave," حَسَنَ "handsome"; in Hebrew, חָכֵם "wise," יָשָׁר "upright," רָשָׁע "wicked." The form *ḵatil* may be exemplified in the one language by بَطِرَ "proud," دَنَسَ "dirty," عَاجَلَ "quick"; in the other, by כָּבֵד "heavy," זָקֵן "old," טָמֵא "unclean." As instances of the form *ḵatul* I will cite in Arabic فָطِنَ "clever," يَقُظُ "awake," حָذَرُ "timid"; in Hebrew, יָזַר "afraid," קָטַן "small," גָּבַהַ "high."

In seeking to modify these simple forms, so as to make them express greater extension or greater energy, the Semites adopted one of two methods; they either *lengthened a vowel*, or they *doubled a consonant*. The former process might affect either the first or second vowel; the latter affected chiefly the middle consonant.

The heightening of the first vowel of *ḵatal* would yield the form *ḵâtâl*, which is of comparatively rare occurrence, as in طَابَعَ and خَاتَمَ, "a stamp," "a seal," Heb. חוֹתֶם, and in the participles of Hebrew verbs לָה, as חוֹה for חוֹי (i.e. ḥâsai). The vowel of the second syllable has generally been weakened into *i*, thus rendering it indistinguishable from the heightening of *ḵatil*, viz. *ḵâtîl*. Hence, in the words just cited, the forms طَابَعَ, خَاتَمَ, as well as the great bulk of the participles of the form قَاتِلٌ, Heb. קוֹטֵל. Here the lengthening of the first vowel seems to express the continuity or duration of the action.

The heightening of the 2nd vowel yields us the common intensives of the form *ḵatâl*, *ḵatîl* and *ḵatûl*. (1) *Ḷatâl*, as in Arabic شَجَاعٌ "brave," جَبَانٌ "cowardly," كَبَامٌ "blunt"; Heb. גָּדוֹל "great," עֹשׂוֹק "an oppressor," קְדוֹשׁ "holy." (2) *Ḷatîl*, as in Arabic رَحِيمٌ "merciful," كَرِيمٌ "noble," ثَقِيلٌ "heavy"; Heb. גָּרִיִם "wounded," قָטִיל "slain," אֲסִיר "bound, a prisoner"; Heb. נָבִיא "a prophet," חָסִיד "gracious, pious"; אֲסִיר "bound, a prisoner," מְשִׁיחַ "anointed." (3) *Ḷatûl*, as in Arabic أَكُولٌ "gluttonous," كَذُوبٌ "lying," جَسُورٌ "daring"; Heb. עָצוּם "strong," חָרוּץ "sharp," נְחוֹשׁ "brazen," and the ordinary participle passive קְטוּל.

The Aramaic furnishes us with an example of the heightening of *both* vowels in the form *ḵâtôtûl*, as נְטוּרָא; חֲסִיּוֹן; פְּרוּזָא; נְהִיטָא.

The doubling of the 2nd consonant appears in Hebrew in the common form *ḵattal*, intensive of *ḵatal*; e.g. טַבַּח "cook," טַבַּח "executioner," חֲרַטַּח "cutter," קַנַּא "jealous," and with

weakening of the first vowel in the shut syllable אָכָר “husbandman.” Also in the form *ḵattil*, intensive of *ḵatil*, with weakening of the 1st vowel to *i* in the shut syllable and tone-lengthening of the 2nd into *ē*, *ḵittēl*, as גִּבֵּן “humpbacked,” עוֹר “blind,” פִּקֵּחַ “openeyed, seeing,” חֵרֵשׁ “deaf.”

The intensives of the first grade, *ḵatāl*, *ḵatīl*, and *ḵatūl*, are all capable of being heightened in the same way, thus yielding the forms *ḵattāl*, *ḵattīl*, and *ḵattūl*. (1) *Ḵattāl* is very common in Arabic and Aramaic, e.g. ⁵صَيَّادٌ, ⁵نَجَّارٌ, ⁵خَبَّاحٌ. In Hebrew we find קַנּוּא “jealous,” with *ô* for *â*, but more usually the vowel of the 1st syllable is weakened into *i*, e.g. יִסּוֹר “one who reprehends” or “finds fault” (Job xl. 2 or xxxix. 32), שִׁבּוֹר “drunken,” גִּבּוֹר = גִּבּוֹר “just,” צַדִּיק “strong,” אֲבִיר “just,” עֲרִיץ “exulting,” “rejoicing,” “oppressor,” “tyrant,” עֲרִיץ “just,” אֲבִיר “exact.”

In Arabic the first vowel is weakened into *i*, e.g. ⁵سَكَمِيرٌ “drunken,” ⁵صَدِيقٌ “very truthful,” ⁵عَرِيضٌ “very fond of meddling.” (3) *Ḵattūl*, as Heb. רַחוּם “merciful,” חַנוּן “gracious,” שִׁבּוֹל “deprived, bereft of young,” אֶלּוּף “tame, domesticated, intimate”; Arab. ⁵قَدُوسٌ “very timid,” ⁵قَيُّومٌ “abiding, everlasting,” ⁵قَدُوسٌ “most holy.” In Arabic the vowel of the 1st syllable is sometimes assimilated to that of the 2nd, as ⁵سَبُوحٌ or ⁵قَدُوسٌ “all pure” or “all glorious.”

Another important class of nouns in the Semitic languages is the so-called *Segolates*, of which the normal form is *ḵatl*, *ḵitl*, *ḵutl*, still retained in Arabic, e.g. ⁵أَرْضٌ “earth,” ⁵عَجَلٌ “calf,” ⁵أَنْعَامٌ “car.” They are also used as adjectives, e.g. ⁵صَعْبٌ “diffi-

cult," עֲדָב "sweet"; טָלַל "small, young," גָּל "large, coarse";

סָלַב "hard," חָלו "sweet," מָר "bitter." The corresponding Aramaic forms are *k'tal*, *k'til*, *k'tul*, with transposition of the vowels, which however resume their normal place in the emphatic state, e.g. חֲטִילָא, חֲטִילָא, חֲטִילָא. The ordinary Hebrew forms are identical with the Arabic, for the 2nd vowel in Hebrew is merely supplementary, and disappears before a suffix; e.g. אֶרֶץ for אֶרֶץ, with suffix אֶרְצוֹ; סֶפֶר for סֶפֶר, with suffix סֶפֶרְךָ; אֶזְרָא for אֶזְרָא or אֶזְרָא, with suffix אֶזְרָאִי. But the Aramaic forms are also found in our Hebrew text, though more sparingly, in the construct state; e.g. גִּבֹר תָּמִים Ps. xviii. 26; בִּזְרֵעֶיךָ Num. xi. 7; נָטַע שְׁעֵשׂוּעֵי Isa. v. 7; מִסְפָּחַר כֶּסֶף Prov. iii. 14; and the like.

I have dwelt for a little while on these classes of nouns, because I believe that they really lie at the root of the inflection of the verb in the Semitic languages. In one of the most recent Hebrew Grammars, that of Prof. Bernh. Stade (1879), you will find plainly stated, what I have long believed, that the verbal forms of the Semites are really nominal forms, mostly in combination with pronouns. Each person of the verb is, so to say, a sentence, consisting of a noun and a pronoun, which has gradually been contracted or shrivelled up into a single word. The same view was enunciated some years before by Philippi, in an article on the Semitic verb in the volume entitled *Morgenländische Forschungen*, 1875, and by Sayce in the JRAS. 1877 and in his lectures on Assyrian Grammar.

With this idea in our minds, let us submit the different forms of the Semitic verb to a careful analysis, selecting for the purpose the first or simplest form, and commencing, according to ancient custom, with the perfect state².

¹ [The absolute state and construct of nouns of this class usually appear with א instead of א except before gutturals or *rîsh*.]

² [Cf. Nöldeke's article "Die Endungen des Perfects" in *ZDMG.* vol. xxxviii (1884), p. 407 sqq.]

I. *The Perfect.*

In Arabic, the 3rd pers. sing. masc. exhibits three forms, *ḵátala*, *ḵátila*, *ḵátula*, precisely corresponding to the three nominal or adjectival forms mentioned above. The form *ḵátala* is, generally speaking, transitive: whilst *ḵátila* and *ḵátula* are intransitive, the latter being the stronger form of the two. Here then we are face to face with the oldest and simplest form of this state and person; and here we at once encounter one of our greatest difficulties, the explanation of the final vowel *a*. On the whole I am inclined, after careful consideration, to acquiesce for the present in Stade's view, that we have here a simple noun, without any pronominal affix, and that the final *a* is really the oldest termination of the Semitic noun. If so, *ḵátala* would be an ancient adjective signifying "killing," or, as a verbal form, "he killed": حَزَنَ would signify "sorrowing" or "he sorrowed";

ثَقُلَ, "being heavy" or "it was heavy." It is possible however that *ḵatala* may already be a contraction for *ḵatal-ya*, with the pronominal element *ya* postfixed, like *ta*, *na*, etc. That the final vowel existed anterior to the separation of the Semitic stock, is apparent from the following considerations. (1) The Ethiopic has also the forms *ḵátala* and *ḵétla*. (2) The Hebrew and Aramaic, which (like the vulgar Arabic) drop the final vowel under ordinary circumstances, retain it when a pronominal suffix follows; e.g. Heb. קָטַלְתִּי, but קָטַלְתָּ *ḵ'ṭālā-nī* = Arab. *ḵatala-nī*; Aram. קָטַלְתָּ *ḵ'ṭal*, but with suffix קָטַלְתָּנִי *ḵaṭlā-n* for *ḵaṭlā-nī*, *ḵatala-nī*.

The Arabic has, as we have seen, three forms of the perfect state, distinguished by the vowels *a*, *i*, *u*. The same distinctions are maintained, to a greater or less extent, in the modern dialects, e.g. in Egypt, *katab*, "he wrote," فَضَّلَ *ḵaḍḍil*, "it was over and above," كَثَّرَ *kitir*, *kutur*, "it was much," سَكَتَ *sikit*, *sukut*, "he was silent." The existence of the same forms in the other Semitic languages can easily be proved. In Ethiopic the

transitive form is identical with the Arabic, $\Phi\tau\Lambda$: *katála* = كَتَل . In the intransitive forms the vowels *i* and *u* were both weakened to *ǝ*, and finally dropped, whence resulted such words as $\rho\eta\acute{\alpha}$: *yabsa*, "to be dry," $\delta\delta\Phi$: "to be just," $\lambda\Phi\rho$: "to be satisfied with drink," $\phi\zeta\Omega$: "to be near," exactly corresponding to rare Arabic forms like عَلِمَ for عَلِمَ , رَضِيَ for رَضِيَ , حَسَنَ for حَسَنَ , قَرَبَ for قَرَبَ . If the 2nd radical was a guttural, an assimilation of the first vowel to the 2nd took place, giving us the series *katála*, *kētála*, *kētla*. e.g. סחל : "to pity," הלל : "to be hot," = سَخِنَ رَحِم . Similar forms also exist in classical Arabic, e.g. شهد for شَهِد , ذهب for ذَهَبَ "to be dazzled with the sight of gold," نعم or نَعِم , بئس or بُئِس . In Hebrew we find in like manner all three vowels, although the forms in *i* and *u* are disappearing, as in vulgar Arabic. For example, with *i*, זקן "to be old," טהר "to be pure," גביר "to be heavy," ירא "to fear"; with *u*, יכל "to be able," שכל "to be bereft," יגר "to be afraid." On the other hand, שמעו , but שמע , as in vulgar Arabic سمع for the classical سَمِعَ (شَمِعَ); גבר , but גברו , גבר , but גברו , גבר , but גברו ; גבר , but גברו ; and many more. In Aramaic, verbs with *u* are nearly as rare as in Hebrew; e.g. דמוך "he slept"; חרוב "it was dried up, waste, desolate"; חכול "he was bereft." In Syriac only one such seems to be certain, viz. ܡܚܝܝܐ "to be shrivelled," as in Job vii. 5, ܡܚܝܝܐ ܡܚܝܝܐ ; Ps. cxviii. 120, ܡܚܝܝܐ ܡܚܝܐ . Another may perhaps be found in ܐܚܥܡܐ , Nahum ii. 10, if that stand for ܐܚܥܡܐ , in the phrase ܐܚܥܡܐ ܐܚܥܡܐ .

ܚܬܐ, ܐܬܬܐ, ܐܬܬܐ. Verbs of the form *kaṭila* are, on the contrary, very common in Aramaic; as ܡܠܝܟ, ܡܠܝܟ;

ܝܡܝܬ, ܝܡܝܬ. Regarding Assyrian I find it difficult to say anything, owing to the conflict among the grammarians as to the real nature of certain forms. Schrader quotes a word *mīti*, "he is dead," which would correspond to the Heb. מֵת, Syr. ܡܝܬ, except in its rather perplexing final vowel¹.

I proceed to the 3rd pers. sing. fem.

If we have rightly regarded *kaṭala*, etc., as being originally nouns, without any pronominal affix, we should naturally expect the existence of a feminine formed in the same way as in the noun. And this is actually the case. The fem. of *kaṭala* is formed, as in the noun, by the addition of *t*. The Arabic has *kaṭalat*; the Ethiopic, *kaṭālat*, *yābsat* for *yābisat*, *mēḥrat* for *māḥirat*. In vulgar Arabic, e.g. in Egypt, we have the forms *katabet*, *fidlet*, *suktet*. In Aramaic the same form occurs, with the further weakening of the 1st vowel, in the now shut syllable, into *i*, viz. ܩܬܠܬ, ܩܬܠܬ, for *kaṭlat*, *kaṭ'lat*, *kaṭalat*. In Hebrew the usual form is *kāṭ'la*, קָטְלָה, with the same termination *ā* as in the noun; but as in the one case so in the other, *ā* is only a weakened form of *at*, the successive steps being *at*, *ath*, *ah*, *ā*. The proof lies in the following facts². (1) The termination *at* actually occurs, e.g. in אֵלֶּת Deut. xxxii. 36, הָטַאת (for הָטַאת) Exod. v. 16, קָרַאת (for קָרַאת) Deut. xxxi. 29, שָׁבַת Ezek. xli. 17, עִשָּׂת (for עִשָּׂת) Levit. xxv. 21; etc. (2) The termination *at* has always been retained before pronominal suffixes, in which case we find the forms אֶהְבֵּתְהוּ, אֶהְבֵּתְהוּ, and the like. The difference of vocalisation depends upon the difference of accentuation, a point on which I shall offer a few remarks by

¹ [Delitzsch writes *mēti*, and recognises a permansive form *kaṭil* as common to most verbal themes, to express the idea of prolonged or completed activity as well as that of a permanent state or affection; *Ass. Gr.* p. 235, sq.]

² [Cf. p. 133, supra.]

and by, after we have treated of the 3rd pers. plur. masc. and fem. The final *t* is also lost in Phoenician, e.g. יטנא (prob. יטנא) in a Cyprian inscr. of B.C. 254 [*C.I.S.* 93]; in Carthag. inscr. נדרא or נדרע, "she vowed" (also נדרעא), שמע "she (Tanith) heard," for שמעא, etc. I will only add that the final *t* disappears also in Mandaitic before enclitic ב and ל with suffixes, e.g. נפאלאלה, "she fell," for נפאלאתלה, instead of נפאלאת. So also in the dialect of the Talmūd Bablī, עריקת "she fled," אולת "she went," side by side with שלהח ליה, אמרה ליה, and in derived conjugations אינסבא ליה "she was married," איקדשה ליה "she was betrothed to him." In such Talmudic forms as הוא for הות, and אתא אחתיה "his sister came" for אתת, we may perhaps discover a lingering trace of the original 3rd radical *yūd*.

If we be right in regarding *ḡatala*, etc., as originally nouns without pronom. affix, we shall again expect to find their plural agreeing in form with that of the nouns. This is also really the case. We shall not be far wrong in assuming *ḡatalūna* as the oldest form of the 3rd pers. plur. masc., which is still preserved to us in ידעון Deut. viii. 3, 16, and perhaps in צקון "poured forth" Isa. xxvi. 16; as also in the Aramaic forms קטלון, and the Assyrian *katlūni*, side by side with *katlū*. Usually, however, the final *n* has been dropped, as in the construct state of the noun; whence we obtain the ordinary Arabic *ḡatalū*¹, the Ethiopic *ḡatalū*, *lālsū*, *məḥrū*; the Heb. קטלו; and the Aramaic קטלו. In the Aramaic dialects the process of corruption has gone yet farther. The Syriac pronounces *ḡʿtal*, and hence we find in old MSS. صُل as well as the more accurate صُلّه. In Mandaitic too the ordinary form is כגיד, נפאק, though the termination *n* is sometimes restored before enclitics, as נצאבולאך

¹ Arabic قَتَلُوا and قَتَلُوا, as in Hebrew occasionally קטלוּ, e.g. יהלכו Josh. x. 24, אבוּ Isa. xxviii. 12, if the text be correct. Sayce makes a strange blunder in considering the quiescent *alif* of the Arabic to be a trace of the original *n*.

“they planted for thee.” I may add that in Mandaitic the full form in *ān* is usually preceded by a *yūd*, for the insertion of which I find it hard to account; e.g. רְהִיטִיּוֹן, סְלִיקִיּוֹן, נִפְאִקִיּוֹן “they ran.” In the dialect of the Talmūd Babilī we find the same rejection of the termination *ān*, but it seems to leave its mark in an assimilation of the vowel of the preceding syllable; thus, אָסוּר “they have bound” or “banned,” for אֶסְרוּ; עָבוּד for נִפְקוּ; נִפְקוּ for עָבְדוּ.

The feminine of *ḵatalāna* we should naturally expect, in accordance with the nominal flexion, to be *ḵatalāna*; and though this form has entirely disappeared in Hebrew, it exists in the other languages. In the Aramaic dialects we find the final *n* retained, in the termination *ān*, or, with a weakening of the vowel, *ān*. So in the Targūms there occur such words as אֶמְרָן “were made clear”; in Mandaitic, with inserted *yūd*, רְגִאוּיָאן “they were angry”; in Syriac, مَلَّكْ for *kʿtālān*. The Arabic exhibits the form *ḵatalna*, which I cannot as yet make up my mind to regard as anything else than a strong contraction of *ḵatalāna*¹. It has almost gone out of use in the vulgar dialects. Several of the ancient Semitic languages, however, reject the final *n*. The Ethiopic is *nagārā*, *lābsā*, *mēlhrā*; the J. Aram. קִטְלָא. The Syriac must of course have once had the form *kʿtālān*, but dropped the final vowel, whence we find in MSS. both مَلَّكْ and مَلَّ. In the Christian Palestinian dialect we find קִטְלִי, and so also in Samaritan; but the Mandaitic writes נִפְאִק, סְלִיק, like the Syriac. The older form with the final vowel *ā* appears in Syriac only before some of the pronominal suffixes, e.g. قَتَلْنِي “they have killed me,” قَتَلْنِيْ, قَتَلْنِيْ, corresponding with the Jewish Aramaic קִטְלִי, קִטְלִי, קִטְלִי.

In what I have said of the 3rd pers. plur. masc. and fem. I

¹ [It would seem from a deletion in the ms., that Prof. Wright had hesitated between this view and that of Nöldeke (*ZDMG.* xxxviii. 412) who regards the Arabic *ḵatalna* as formed on the analogy of the corresponding imperfect form *yaḵtulna*.]

have gone on the assumption that the original forms are *ḵatalīna* and *ḵatalāna*. I must tell you however that this is altogether denied by such scholars as Noeldeke and G. Hoffmann¹, who maintain the originals to be *ḵatalū* and *ḵatalū*, and explain the forms in *ūn* and *ān* or *ēn* as later pronominal additions, comparing in particular the vulg. Arab. *katabum* for *katabū*, i.e. *katabū* + *hum* (see Noeldeke in *ZDMG.* xxxviii. p. 410), or else as analogical formations to *كَلَمَ*, *كَلَمَ*; *كَلَمَ*, *كَلَمَ*; *كَلَمَ*, *كَلَمَ*; *كَلَمَ*, *كَلَمَ*;

Here I will make, as promised, a few remarks on the accentuation of certain of these verbal forms and the changes in vocalisation which result therefrom.

The original accentuation of the 3rd pers. I believe to have been that of the old Arabic, *ḵátala*, *ḵátalat*, *ḵátalū*. The Ethiopic, Hebrew and Aramaic carried the accent onward to the next syllable, thus obtaining the forms *ḵátála*, *ḵátálat*, *ḵátálū*; *ḵátál*; and *ḵátál*, *ḵátálū*. The vulgar dialects of the Arabic vary, I believe, between *ḵátal* and *ḵátál*. But in the intransitive forms the Ethiopic left the accent unshifted, and dropped the vowel of the middle syllable, *yábsa*, *sékhna*. That the Hebrew accentuation too was once the same as in the old Arabic is clear, as it seems to me, from the vocalisation in particular of the fem.

קָטַלָהּ and the plur. *קָטַלּוּ*, which have now the accent on the last syllable. Had the accent originally fallen on that syllable in the verb, as it does in the noun, we should have had the forms *קָטַלָהּ* and *קָטַלּוּ*, as in the noun we have *הַכֶּמֶה* from *הָכֶם*. But this is not the case. On the contrary, we find the Ethiopic accentuation of the 2nd syllable in the so-called pausal forms, e.g. *נִכְלָהּ*, *דִּבְכָהּ*, *נִתְנָהּ*; and it is only when pronom. suffixes are appended, and the tone is consequently thrown forwards towards the end of the word, that we get in Hebrew the forms *קָטַלָהּ* and *קָטַלּוּ*, e.g. *אֶכְלָהּ*, *אֶכְלָהּ*, and *אֶכְלָהּ*; just as in Ethiopic we have *nagarátō*, *nagarú-nī*, *nagaréwō*, and in Arabic itself *ḵatalát-hu*, *ḵatalú-hu*. The Aramaic 3rd pers. sing. fem.

¹ [See *ZDMG.* xxxii. 747.]

קטלת, ^{קטלת} ^{קטלת}, also favours this view, for the suppression of the 2nd vowel of the original *kaṭalat* must have been due to the accentuation of the 1st syllable, as in the modern Arabic of Egypt, *ḵatalet*, *awldet*, *kūltet*. With suffixes the form approximates more to the Hebrew, e.g. קטלתה, ^{קטלתה} ^{קטלתה}; Mand.

לא כאלתא "she has not devoured me," אנאלתה "she devoured him." The Mand. form with enclitics, e.g. נפאלתה "she fell," is almost identical with the Heb. אכלתה.

Passing on to the 2nd person, we find that the Semitic languages split into two divisions, the one exhibiting *t* as the characteristic letter of the pronominal ending, the other *k*. On the one side are the Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, and Assyrian; on the other, the Ethiopic, and most likely the Ḥimyaritic. At least we are told that the South Arabian of the present day says

كنت ^{كنت} ^{كنت} *kunt* "thou wast"; and the form with ^ك ^ك *k* for ^ت ^ت *t* is vouched for in other parts of Arabia¹. It is hard to say which is the more ancient form, if either. More probably the two existed side by side from remote antiquity, as we find in all of these languages the separate form with *t*, *anta*, etc., as well as the accus. and genit. suffixes with *k*. In quite modern times the *k* appears where we should not have expected it, as in the Samaritan hymns, גלית ^{גלית} ^{גלית} for גלית "thou hast revealed," and

in a dialect of Syria ^{انتو} ^{انتو} ^{انتو} for ^{انتو} ^{انتو} or ^{انتو} ^{انتو}. It should further be noted that in the 2nd person no variation is made as to the verbal part of the word, for the purpose of indicating the sex and number of the person or persons addressed. The whole weight of these distinctions has to be borne by the pronominal part. It appeared perhaps to be a waste of energy to point out these differences in both parts, and if one was to be selected, the pronoun seemed to be the better adapted for the purpose.

The 2nd pers. sing. masc. is in classical Arabic ^{انت} ^{انت} ^{انت}, in

¹ See Noeldeke, *ZDMG.* xxxviii. 413; Halévy, *Études Sabéennes*, p. 46.

vulg. Arab. *katābt, misíkt, kutúrt*. In Hebrew the final vowel is often indicated by the addition of the letter ה, קָטַלְתָּה or קָטַלְתָּ. The Ethiopic equivalent is *ḵatálka*. The other dialects, like the vulgar Arabic, have dropped the final vowel. Hence in Bibl. Aramaic קָטַלְתָּ and קָטַלְתָּ; in the Targūms קָטַלְתָּ and קָטַלְתָּ, in Syriac ܡܕܠܬܐ.

In Arabic and Ethiopic the accent naturally rests on the 2nd syllable, *ḵatálta, ḵatálka*; but when an accus. suffix is added, the Ethiopic throws forward the tone, *ḵatalká-nī, ḵatalká-na*, and lengthens the vowel before the uncontracted forms of the suffixes of the 3rd pers., *ḵatalkā-hū* or *ḵatalkó, ḵatalkāhā*, etc. In Hebrew the tone is thrown forward not only with pronom. suffixes, but also when the so-called vāv conversive precedes; וְקָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּנִי, but קָטַלְתָּהוּ or קָטַלְתָּהּ, etc. Similarly in Jewish Aramaic, with suffixes, קָטַלְתָּנִי, קָטַלְתָּהּ, but in Syriac ܡܕܠܬܐܢ, ܡܕܠܬܐܢܝ, in Mand. ܫܒܐܩܬܗܢ, and in the Talmūd מְנַעַתִּי "hast hindered me," אֶדְבַרְתִּי "hast reminded me." I do not regard the vowel of the Ethiopic and Syriac forms as proving that the termination *ta* had originally a long vowel, *tā*, which is Noeldeke's view; on the contrary, I believe that the lengthening of the vowel is here due partly to the weight of the accent, but still more to an effort to distinguish this form from the almost identical one of the 3rd sing. fem., ܡܕܠܬܐ "she has killed me." Others would explain it as a contraction of the final vowel of *ta* with a supposed connective vowel *a*, as if ܡܕܠܬܐܢܝ stood for *ḵatalta-anī*.

To the masc. form of the 2nd pers. *anta* corresponds the fem. *anti*; and hence we should expect to find the 2nd pers. sing. fem. of the verb the form *ḵatalti*, which is actually the case.

The Arabic has قَتَلْتَ, and the *i* is often lengthened before suffixes, كَسَرْتِي or كَسَرْتِي. The vulg. form of the present day is

قتلتی *ḡataltī*. The corresponding Ethiopic form is *ḡatalkī*, written, according to the exigencies of the Geez syllabary, with long *ī*, which passes before suffixes into *ē* or *ey*, as *nagarkē-nī*, *nagarkēyō*, *nagarkēyōmū*. In Hebrew the ordinary form is קָטַלְתָּ with the loss of the final vowel; but קָטַלְתִּי is sufficiently common, though usually altered by the Massorites into קָטַלְתִּי; e.g. יִרְדְּתִי and שָׁבַבְתִּי, Ruth iii. 3, 4; לְמַדְתִּי Jerem. ii. 33; דִּבַּרְתִּי Jerem. iii. 5. Sometimes the full form seems to have been left through a misunderstanding; e.g. Jerem. ii. 20, where שָׁבַבְתִּי and נִתְקַתִּי seem to be 2nd pers. sing. fem. rather than 1st pers.; so also Micah iv. 13, וְהִחַרְמְתִּי. Similarly before suffixes, קָטַלְתִּי, קָטַלְתִּיהוּ or קָטַלְתִּיו, etc. Forms like יִלְדְּתָנוּ, Jerem. ii. 27 (*Keth.* יִלְדְּתָנִי), or וְהִבְאֵתָנוּ, 2 Sam. xiv. 10, are very rare. In Aramaic the same phenomena present themselves. In Jewish Aramaic we have קָטַלְתָּ side by side with קָטַלְתִּי; whilst the Syriac has preserved the older termination, at least in writing, ܩܬܠܬܐ, with suffixes ܩܬܠܬܐܢܝ, ܩܬܠܬܐܝܗܘܢ. Here again I regard the vowel of the syllable *ti* as being originally short, whilst Noeldeke regards it as long. To me the lengthening seems to be due to the shifting of the accent.

The plural of *anta*, as you may remember, we found to be in its oldest form *antumū*; and consequently we expect in the verb for the 2nd pers. plur. masc. the form *ḡataltumū*, which actually occurs in Arabic poetry and before suffixes, قَتَلْتُمُونِي, قَتَلْتُمْ.

Generally however the final vowel is dropped, *antum*, قَتَلْتُمْ; and the common form in the vulgar language is قَتَلْتُوا with the loss of the final *m*. Parallel to these run the Ethiopic forms with *k*, viz. *ḡatalkēmmū*, with suffixes *ḡatalkēmmū-nī*, *ḡatalkēmmēcō*, *ḡatalkēmmēcōmū*. The corresponding form in the modern Tigré

and Tigrîna is *ḡatalkūn* or *ḡatalātḡūn*, which latter appears in Amharic as *ḡatalāchhū*, **ተለሐኩ**. In S. Arabia these forms with *k* are heard at the present day, e.g. **سمعكم** *samīkum* (Halévy, *Études Sab.* p. 46). As *antum* becomes in Heb. **אַתֶּם**, so *ḡatāltum* appears in the shape of **קְטַלְתֶּם**, the accent being thrown forward upon the pronoun, as in Ethiopic. The original vowel appears however, in the rather rare form **קְטַלְתִּי** (corresponding to the vulgar Arabic **قَتَلْتُ**, used in connexion with accusative suffixes (Num. xx. 5, xxi. 5, Zech. vii. 5). In Aramaic *n* takes the place of *m* in pronoun and verb. Thus in Syriac **ܩܬܠܬܝܢܐ**; in Mand. **נצאבתון** “ye planted.” In the latter dialect the final *n* disappears before enclitics, as **נצאבתיליא** “ye have planted me,” **שארארתוליא** “ye have sent me”: and also before accusative suffixes, as **נצאבתון** “ye took me,” **שארארתון** “ye sent me,” which is contrary to Syriac usage, but in accordance with Hebrew and Chaldee, where we find **קְטַלְתִּינִי**, **קְטַלְתִּינוּ**, **קְטַלְתִּינוּן**. In the Talmūd such forms as **בְּעִיתוֹ**, **סְפִיתוֹ**, occur even without suffixes, as in vulgar Arabic.

The feminine of *antumū* we found to be in its fullest form *antunna*, whence the fem. of *ḡataltum* should be *ḡataltunna*. This actually occurs in old Arabic, though it has disappeared from the vulgar dialects. The Ethiopic form is analogous to the Arabic, but has lost the final syllable, *ḡatalkēn*; the final vowel appears, however, in the form with suffixes *ḡatalkēnāhū* (Cornill, *das Buch der zweisen Philosophen*, p. 51). But, on the other hand, the form is also liable to a further mutilation before suffixes into *ḡatalkā* (Dillmann, p. 274). The Hebrew form is almost identical with the Ethiopic, viz., **קְטַלְתָּן**. The existence of a longer form in **תָּנָה**, exemplified by **הִשְׁלַכְתָּנָה**, Amos iv. 3, is very doubtful; and no example with accus. suffixes occurs. The Aramaic forms are such as we might expect, **ܩܬܠܬܝܢܐ**, **ܩܬܠܬܝܢܐ**.

In Mandaitic however the feminine is a rarity, its place being mostly usurped by the masculine.

Proceeding to the 1st pers. sing., I would remind you that the root form of the pronoun of the 1st pers. we found to be *iya* or *i*, giving, in combination with the demonstrative *an*, the form *aniya* or *anî*. We found also that some of the Semitic languages inserted a second demonstrative, *ak*, whence the Assyrian *anāku*, the Hebrew אֲנִי, the Moabite אֲנִי, and the Phoenician אֲנִי and אֲנִי *anech*. It is this latter form that has given rise to the verbal affix in the Ethiopic *ḵatalkū*, which is also said to be the form in use in S. Arabia, كَتَّكَ, اَعْتَفَرَكْ, etc. (comp. Halévy, *Études Sabéennes*, p. 46). In the other Semitic languages we encounter an affix form with *t* instead of *k*, which demands explanation. It may be that *t* has interchanged with *k*, as in the 2nd person we find *ta* and *ka*; but more probably, I think, *tu* has been substituted for *ku* in the 1st person under the influence of the forms of the 2nd person. The solitary *ḵatalku* gave way before the greater number of *t*-forms, and was gradually changed into *ḵataltu*, except, as we have seen, in Ethiopic (which was destitute of *t*-forms in the 2nd person).

While the Assyrian pronoun *anākū* (Haupt *anakū*) is indisputably older, in respect of its *ā*, than the Hebrew *ānōkhî*, the latter would appear to have preserved the termination in a purer form. We may therefore fairly assume that the Arabic *ḵatāltu* and the Ethiopic *ḵatālkū* represent, in respect of the final vowel, a somewhat later stage than the corresponding Hebrew קָטַלְתִּי, with vāv conversive וְקָטַלְתִּי, with suffixes קָטַלְתִּיהוּ or קָטַלְתִּיו, etc. Whether the *scriptio defectiva* in such forms as יָדַעַת Job xlii. 2, בָּנִית 1 Kings viii. 48, is merely accidental, or really indicates a tendency to dull the final vowel or to drop it altogether, it is hard to say. The Moabite and Phoenician forms were doubtless identical with the Hebrew. King Mesha' writes מִלְכִּי, בִּנְתִּי, etc., and in one Phoen. inscr. we find בִּנְתִּי (Umm 'Awāmid, *C.I.S.* nr. 7), though the usual spelling is בִּנְת. Plautus too has *corathi* for קִרְאֲתִי. In Aramaic the suffix sometimes

appears in full, especially in the case of verbs 3rd ʾ , as קָנִיתִי , אֲסִנִּיתִי ; but more frequently the suffix has lost its vowel, the usual form being קָטַלְתָּ , קָטַלְתָּ , which stands for kāṭlat , by transposition from kāṭalt , which is the form used in vulg. Arab., kāṭalt , misikt , kuturt . The transposition probably took place to distinguish it from the 2nd pers. קָטַלְתָּ , קָטַלְתָּ ; and the alteration of the vowel in the last syllable may be ascribed, either to the lingering influence of the lost termination ʾ , or to an effort to differentiate this form from the 3rd pers. sing. fem. קָטַלְתָּ , קָטַלְתָּ (for kāṭlat , out of kāṭalat). Remark however a difference between the Biblical Aramaic and the Syriac. The former has *movable shēwā*, עֲבַדְתָּ Dan. iii. 15, vi. 25, קָרַבְתָּ Dan. vii. 16; the latter silent shēwā , עֲבַדְתָּ , קָרַבְתָּ . The older form kāṭalt appears with the accus. suffixes, קָטַלְתָּ , קָטַלְתָּ . The Mandaitic form is ordinarily the same as the Syriac, לִיגִטִּית , נִיפְקִית ; but with the enclitics the t disappears, and we have the vocalisation kāṭalē for kāṭalēth , e.g. גִּטְּאִרִּינָה “I tied to him,” סִלִּיקִיבָה “I went up on it.” In the Targūms we find the fully vocalised form אֲבַרִּיתִי , דִּחִילִיתִי , etc., which is indeed older than the Biblical forms just cited. In the Talmūd Bāblī both the forms which we have noted in the Mandaitic occur independently of enclitics; כָּבַשְׁתִּית “I subdued,” שָׁמַעְתִּית “I heard,” אֲרִגִּישִׁית side by side with אֲמַרִּי “I said,” נִפְקִי “I went out,” חֹוִי “I have seen,” קִרְאִי “I called.” The final vowel is merely tone-long, and hence can be shortened when the tone is thrown back, as הִקְיַמְתָּ , Dan. iii. 14: and with suffixes, as פָּרַעְתִּיהָ , קָטַלְתָּ .

You will remark that in the first person, as in the second, the sex or number of the speaker or speakers is not marked in the verbal part of the word; whilst no variation was thought

necessary in the pronominal part, any more than in the actual pronoun אֲנִי or אָנֹכִי.

As to the plural, the original form of the pronom. affix was probably *nā*, from אֲנַחְנוּ or אֲנֵנוּ; but it underwent various modifications in the several languages, as we shall presently see.

The Hebrew has preserved the old form in קָטַלְנוּ, with suffix קָטַלְנוּהוּ. The Arabic form is *ḡatalnā*, قَتَلْنَا, with long *ā*, which is however sometimes shortened in poetry, *ḡatalnā*. On the other hand, the Ethiopic has *ḡatalna*, with short *ā*, which is lengthened before suffixes: *nagárna*, but *nagarnā-ka*, *nagarnā-kēmmū*. Similar is the Chaldee form קָטַלְנָא, with suffixes

קָטַלְנָנוּ, קָטַלְנָנוּ. In Syriac *nā* is shortened into *n*, مَلْنَا, but the fuller termination appears with pronominal suffixes, as مَلْنَاكَ, etc. The abbreviated form also prevails in the Talmūd Bāblī, אֲשַׁכְּחִי, אֲמַרְנִי. Frequently however the Syriac form is lengthened, by a repetition of the pronoun, into مَلْنَا مَلْنَا (sometimes written مَلْنَا مَلْنَا). This, in the weakened shape of מִן, is the usual termination in Mandaitic, e.g. נַפְאֲקִנִין, נַפְאֲקִנָּה; but with enclitics the older נָא is restored, e.g. נַפְאֲקִנָּה "we went out therein," שַׁאדְאֲרִנָּא "we sent them." The accusative suffixes are added to the shorter form in *n*, as רַהֲמָנָא "we loved thee," פִּתְאֲרִנָּה "we opened it."

I have reserved the *dual* for the last place in our view, because it occurs in only two or three of the Semitic languages, the Arabic and Himyaritic, and possibly the Assyrian. The rest,—Ethiopic, Hebrew, and Aramaic,—lost it in the verb before they reached the stage at which we become acquainted with them.

The Arabic forms are precisely such as we should expect, that is to say, almost identical with those of the noun and pronoun. The 3rd pers. masc. is *ḡatalā*, like the noun in *āni*, construct *ā*, e.g. *raḡulāni*, *raḡulā*. Similarly in the feminine we find in Arabic *ḡatalātā*, formed like *ḡannatāni*, *ḡannatā*, from *ḡannat*.

1 p. m.	فَـيَـمَـ parkin.
f.	فَـيَـ parkân.
plur. 3 p. c.	فَـيَـ parkî.
2 p. c.	فَـيَـ parkîttôn.
1 p. c.	فَـيَـ parkâkî (kûkî),
also	فَـيَـ (فَـيَـ + فَـيَـ).

II. *The Imperfect.*

Having thus discussed the various forms of the perfect state of the verb, I proceed to the consideration of the imperfect.

Here the first thing that strikes us is the different collocation of the parts which go to the constitution of the verbal form. In the perfect the verbal element preceded, and was followed by the pronominal element. The action, as completed, seemed apparently to be more prominent than the agent. In the imperfect, on the contrary, the pronominal element takes precedence of the verbal; the agent seems to be more conspicuous in relation to the still unfinished act. The whole arrangement may of course be, as some have thought, merely accidental; but if we are to seek a reason for it, that just given seems to be the most natural.

Another point of difference between the two verbal states is that the 3rd pers. sing. masc. of the perfect appears to be destitute of any pronominal affix, whereas the corresponding person of the imperfect is furnished with a peculiar pronominal prefix. The reason of this probably also lies in the greater prominence of the pronominal element in the imperfect state. It may of course be said, with Dietrich and Stade, that the 3rd pers. sing. masc. of the imperfect is a noun of the form *yaktul*, يَـكُـتُـلُ, etc., without any pronominal element. But surely the preformative *ya* demands some explanation; and if so, what explanation is more probable than that it is pronominal in its nature? Rödiger connected it with the Amharic ይህ: or ይህ:

Assyrian. The original shape of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. we may assume in this case to have been *yakátilu*. In Ethiopic it appears under the normal form of *yĕkátēl*, and corresponds in its general use with the imperfect indicative of the Arabic; whereas the other form *yĕngēr* answers to the Arabic imperfect subjunctive and jussive. In Assyrian its form, according to Sayce, is *isákinu* or *isákin* [Delitzsch *išákan*], the signification of which is "he makes" or "he will make"; whereas the form *iskun* takes, according to the same authority, the aoristic sense of "he made."

We need not at present dwell longer on this form *yĕkátēl*, because its prefixes and flexion are identical with those of the other form *yĕktēl*, which is common to all the Semitic languages, and therefore better adapted for the purpose of a comparative survey.

Of the different moods,—subjunctive, jussive, and energetic or cohortative,—we will not treat just now, but confine our attention for the present exclusively to the indicative mood.

The 3rd pers. sing. masc. of the imperfect indicative is in classical Arabic *yáktulu*, with *ā* as the vowel of the prefix and a final *ū*. This we may accept as the archetype. The vulgar dialects drop the final vowel and weaken that of the first syllable, *yĕktul*, *yĭktul*, or *iktul*, *yimsik*, *yuskut*; thus giving us the same form which we find already in the Ethiopic *yĕngēr*, the Assyrian *iskun* (יִסְכַּן, "he placed" [Del. יִשְׁכַּן]) or *išbat* (יִצְבַּת, "he seized"), and the Hebrew יִכְבֵּד, יִפְקֹד. This too is the common form in the Aramaic dialects, e.g. Jewish Aram. יִלְבֵּשׁ, יִקְטֹל, with some important exceptions, which we shall specify presently.

That the vowel of the preformative was originally *a* in Hebrew as well as in Arabic we may infer: (1) from verbs of which the first letter is a guttural, as יִהְיֶה, יִאָמַר or יִאָסֵר; (2) from verbs ע"ע, as יִעָזֵר, יִסָּב, which stand for *yasbub*, *yasuz*; and (3) from verbs ע"י, as יִנָּחַם, יִקָּוֶה, which stand for *yaktoum*, *yantouh*. As we have often seen already, an original *pathach* may be gradually weakened into *segol* or *chirek*; but it is impossible that an original *chirek* should in such a case give rise to a *pathach*.

This person of the verb is identical in form, or nearly so, with a class of nouns in the older Semitic languages, which occur partly as proper names and partly as common nouns. Such are in Hebrew, יֶצֶקֶב, יֶצֶקֶב; יֶיֶב "adversary," יֶצֶר "oil"; יֶלְקוֹם "bag," יֶחֱמוֹר "kind of deer," יֶנְשׁוּף "bittern" (?); in Arabic, يَنْبَعُ يَنْبَعُ "the Helper," يَنْعِقُ "the Averter," يَنْخُصِدُ "oryx," يَنْخُصِرُ "male bustard," يَنْبُوعُ "freshly cut branch," يَنْخُصِرُ and يَنْخُصِرُ "green," يَنْبُوعُ "jerboa," يَنْخُصِرُ and يَنْخُصِرُ "male vulture," يَنْبُوعُ "rapid river, horse, etc.," يَنْبُوعُ "queen bee," يَنْغُورُ "gazelle," يَنْمُورُ "lamb, kid," يَنْبُوعُ "fountain," يَنْعِدُ "thickened honey," يَنْعِدُ "a kind of plant."

From all these cases it seems perfectly clear that the prefix *ya* must signify "one who, he who, that which"; but we do not find in the older Semitic languages any pronoun of this signification at all resembling *ya* in sound. In Amharic, one of the modern dialects sprung from the Ge'ez or Ethiopic, we find, it is true, a pronoun *pa ya*, used (exactly like *pa*, *ya*, *ya*) both as the relative and as a sign of the genitive case. Praetorius seems however to have made it tolerably certain that this *ya* is only a modification of the Ethiopic *ha za*, which is still used in Harari, the intermediate link being *sha H* in one of the Tigriña dialects. The change of sound is the same as in the Amharic *pa ya*, *pa ya*, derived through *pa ya*, *pa ya* from an older *pa ya*, *pa ya* = *pa ya*. This comparison therefore fails us. Neither does it seem likely that this *ya* can stand for *wa*, as an abbreviation of *hwa*; because, though initial *w* passes into *y* in Hebrew and Aramaic, the same change does not take place in Arabic and Ethiopic. I am obliged therefore to confess my ignorance of the derivation of this prefix.

Here I may add that some scholars have sought this same pronoun *ya* as a suffix in the perfect. According to them *katata* and *katatu* stand for *katatya* and *katatyn*. For this view I

can find no support whatever save in the Mandaitic plural which I mentioned in a previous lecture, viz. רגאזיאן, fem. רגאזיאן, instead of רגאז. It seems to me, however, very unlikely (1) that the *y* should have been simply elided, without leaving behind any trace of its existence; and (2) that, if it had wholly disappeared in Arabic, Ethiopic, Hebrew, and the older Aramaic, it should have been preserved in the comparatively late Mandaitic. I am compelled therefore to reject this view, though I cannot at present suggest any adequate explanation of the isolated Mandaitic forms just quoted.

I said before that there were some important exceptions to the formation of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. by *ya*. These I now proceed to enumerate.

Already in the Chaldee of the Old Testament we find the verb הוּא forming the 3rd pers. sing. masc. with ל instead of י; להוּא for הוּא in Ezra iv. 13, Dan. ii. 20, with the corresponding plur. masc להוּן Dan. ii. 43, and fem. להוּין Dan. v. 17. The same form is common in the Talmūd Bablī, and occurs also in Mandaitic, in both cases side by side with the forms with *n*; e.g. לִימָא “say,” לְבִיתִי, לְבִיתוֹב “bring”; לִיקוֹם, לִידְמִיא “be like,” לִישְׁתַּרְיָא “be dissolved.” In Syriac the *n* alone is found, הוּלָן, הוּלָס, הוּלָכ, הוּלָכָא. On the whole subject see Mr Lowe’s note in his *Fragment of the Talmud Bablī Pēsachim*. The identity of this *l* and *n* may perhaps be admitted; that either of them sprung from the *y* must be denied. De Goeje (in a review of Kautzsch’s *Gr. des Biblisch-aramäischen*) supposes the form להוּא to be originally an infin. הוּא compounded with the prep. ל, “to be” taken in the sense of “is to be,” “shall be”; and to this הוּא he finds a parallel in the form לְבִנָא, Ezra v. 3, 13. To me it seems that the origin of the *l* may rather be sought in the demonstrative *l*, which is the essential element of the article אַל, הַל, and which appears in various pronouns and demonstrative

adverbs such as *הָלָאָה, תִּסְכֶּה, אֵלַיִן, אֵלָּה, זֶלֶק, הִלָּאָה, אֵלַיִן, הָלָאָה*, etc. The *n*, if it be anything more than a mere variation of the *l*, may also be explained from the demonstrative *n*, which appears for instance in *הֵן, הִלָּאָה*, the nominal base *an*, *אֵן, אַן, הֵנָּה, הֵן*, etc.

The 3rd pers. sing. fem. has for its prefix *ta*, that is, no doubt, the same mark of the fem. gender which we find at the end of the word in the perfect *katalat*. The typical form is again the old Arabic *تَقْتُلُ taqtulu*, vulgarly *taḡtul, teḡtul, tiktul, timsik, tuskut*, which latter coincide with the Assyrian *taskun, taṣbat*, and the Ethiopic *tēngēr, tēlbas*. In Hebrew the *a* of the 1st syllable is ordinarily sunk to *i*, *תִּקְטֹל, תִּכְבֹּד*; but *e* and *a* are found in the same cases as in the masc., e.g. *תִּעֲבֹר, תִּתְאַרֵב*, *תִּתְעַבֵּר, תִּתְאַרֵב*; *תִּתְעַבֵּר, תִּתְאַרֵב*. Similarly in Aramaic, *תִּקְטֹל*, *תִּרְגֹּאז* (Mandaïtic).

Yaqtulu being, as we have seen, essentially a nominal form, its plural is naturally obtained by the usual nominal inflexion, as in the perfect. The most ancient form is once more found in the Arabic *yaqtulūna*, which is vulgarly shortened into *yaqtulū*, though *yaqtulūn* is still heard. In Hebrew the fuller form *יִקְטְלוּ* is not uncommon, as *יִרְגְּמוּ, יִרְכְּסוּ, יִרְגְּמוּ, יִרְכְּסוּ*, in pause *יִרְגְּמוּ, יִרְכְּסוּ*; but the shorter *יִקְטְלוּ* is far more frequent. The Ethiopic forms are *yēngērū, yēlbasū*, with which correspond in accentuation the Hebrew pausal forms *יִפְּלוּ, יִעֲבְרוּ, יִשְׁכְּבוּ, יִחַדְּלוּ*, etc.; and the vulgar Arabic (Egypt) *yik-tūlu, yimsikū, yuskūtū*. The Assyrian exhibits, as we might expect, the forms *iskunū, iṣbatū*. The old Aramaic dialects hold fast the final *n*, *נִשְׁכְּבוּ, נִחַדְּלוּ, נִשְׁכְּבוּ*. So also in Mandaïtic *נישיתלון, נילוגטון* "plant": but before the enclitics the *n* disappears, *נירשימובכון, נישביקולאך* "register with you."

The feminine form corresponding to *yaḳtulūna* would naturally be *yaḳtulāna*. This is actually retained by the Aramaic dialects in the forms ^{לְהִינָן}, ^{יִקְטְלֵן}, Mand. ^{ܢܝܪܝܡܘܢ} “wink.” In Ethiopic and Assyrian we find the same forms with the loss of the final *n*; Eth. *yǝngǝrā*, *yǝlbāsā*; Assy. *iskunā*, *iṣbatā*; and so also in Mandaitic, ^{ܢܝܫܝܓܪܐ}, ^{ܢܝܪܝܡܐ}, are more common than the fuller form in ^{ܐܢ}. The Arabic has contracted *yaḳtulāna* into *yaḳtulna*, after the analogy of *ḳatālna* for *ḳatalāna* in the perfect. The same form occurs in Hebrew; e.g. ^{יַחְמֵנָה} Gen. xxx. 38, ^{וַיִּשְׁרְנָה} 1 Sam. vi. 12 (for ^{וַיִּשְׁרְנָה}), and ^{יַעֲמֹדְנָה} Dan. viii. 22; but more commonly the Hebrew employs a form with prefixed *t*, after the analogy of the singular, and says ^{תִּשְׁבֹּן}, ^{תִּקְטְלֵנָה}, e.g. ^{תִּקְטְלֵנָה}, ^{תִּעֲבֹדְנָה}, ^{תִּפְלֹגְנָה}. The same form occurs dialectically in Arabic, even among the various readings of the *Ḳorʾān*, e.g. *Sūr. xlii. 3*, ^{يَنْفُطْنَ} for ^{تَنْفُطْنَ}. In the vulgar Arabic dialects the fem. seems to have vanished entirely.

The 2nd pers. is formed by prefixing to the verbal element the syllable *ta*, being, as we have already seen, the essential base of the pronoun *anta*. Hence we get, in the sing. masc. the normal *tāḳtulu*, which is the actual Arabic form; in the vulgar dialects, *taḳtul*, *tīḳtul*, *timsik*, *tuskut*. The Assyrian has retained the pure vowel in its *taskun*, *taṣbat*; whilst the Ethiopic exhibits the weaker *tǝngǝr*, *tǝlbās*. The Hebrew offers exactly the same variations as the 3rd pers.; we find ^{תִּקְרַב}, ^{תִּזְכֹּר}, but ^{תִּקְוֹם}, ^{תִּחַג}, ^{תִּחַמַּל}, ^{תִּהְרֹג}, ^{תִּעֲבֹר}, ^{תִּאֲסֹף}. The Aramaic forms, ^{ܬܝܪܓܐܘ}, ^{ܬܝܫܒܘܩ}, Mand. ^{ܬܝܫܒܘܩ}, ^{ܬܝܪܓܐܘ}, call for no remark.

The 2nd pers. sing. fem. is differentiated from the masc. not by any change in the pronominal prefix, but by the addition of the termination *ina*, the origin of which seems quite obscure.

The normal form is again the Arabic ^{تَقْتُلِينَ}, *tāḳtulīna*, which has survived in Hebrew in such forms as ^{תִּדְבְּקִין} Ruth ii. 8, 21 ^{תִּדְבְּעִין} iii. 4; ^{תִּדְבְּעִין} iii. 18. So also in Aramaic, ^{ܬܝܩܬܠܝܢ}, ^{ܬܝܩܬܠܝܢ}.

تَكْتُلِي. In other cases, the final *n* has altogether disappeared, as in the vulgar Arabic تَكْتُلِي *tiktūlī*, *timsikī*, *tuskūtī*; Assyrr. *taskunī*, *tašbatī*; Eth. *təngērī*, *tēlbāsī*; Heb. תִּנְכַּחֲרִי, in pause תִּנְכַּחֲרִי, תִּלְבַּשִׁי, תִּשְׁקָטִי. In Mandaitic this fem. form seems to have gone out of use. In what I have said I regard *ina* as being the original termination of this person, and *ī* as a shortening thereof. Other scholars take *ī* to be the original termination, and consider *in*, *ina* to be a later formation after the analogy of the plur. *ūn*, *ūna*.

The formation of the plural in the 2nd pers. is identical with that in the 3rd. The normal form in the masc. is, as usual, the Arabic تَقْتُلُونَ. The final *n* is preserved in Hebrew in such words as תִּשְׁמְרוּן, תִּחְקְרוּן, תִּעֲמְדוּן; or with fuller vowels in pause, תִּשְׁמְרוּן, תִּחְקְרוּן, תִּעֲמְדוּן. So also in Aramaic. תִּקְטְלוּן, Mand. תִּירִימוּן or more frequently תִּירִימוּן. In vulgar Arabic the final syllable has been rejected, leaving تَكْتُلُوا *tiktūlu*, *timsikū*, *tuskūtū*; with which correspond the Assyrian *taskunū*, *tašbatū*, the Ethiopic *təngērū*, *tēlbāsū*, and the Hebrew תִּנְכַּחְרוּ, תִּלְבְּשׁוּ, תִּשְׁמְרוּ; in pause, with fuller vowels, תִּשְׁמְרוּ, תִּחְקְרוּ, תִּעֲמְדוּ. In Mandaitic too the *n* disappears before the enclitics, as in the 3rd person.

The fem. corresponding with *taḳtulūna* ought to be *taḳtulāna*; and this form is preserved, with the loss of only the final vowel, in the Aramaic תִּקְטְלִי. In Mandaitic, however, it seems to have fallen into disuse. The Assyrian and Ethiopic exhibit forms with the loss of the final *n*; Assyrr. *taskunā*, *tašbatā*; Eth. *təngērā*, *tēlbāsā*. In Arabic *taḳtulāna* is contracted as I take it, after the same manner as the 3rd pers. fem., into *taḳtūlna*, a form which is lost in the vulgar dialects, but has been preserved in some examples in Hebrew, e.g. תִּקְסַמְנָה, Ezek. xiii. 23, תִּשְׁאִינָה, Ezek. xxiii. 49, and a very few more.

An example like **הִרְאֵנִי**, Song of Songs i. 6, shows that here, as well as in other cases, in Hebrew the masc. was gradually supplanting the fem.

The prefix of the 1st pers. sing. **אֲנִי** is apparently derived from the corresponding pronoun **אֲנִי**, **أَنَا**. In Arabic it is **أَنْتَل** (vulg. *aḵtul, amsik, askut*), which appears in Assyrian, with the loss of the final vowel, as *askun, ašbat*. In Ethiopic the vowel is weakened, *əngər, əlbas*; and so also in Aramaic, **אֲנִי**, **ܐܢܝܐ**, Mand. **עֲשׂוּב**. Similarly in Hebrew, **אֲנִי**, **אֲנִי**, **אֲנִי**; but **אֲנִי**, with the original *a*.

The corresponding plural takes its prefix *na* from **אֲנִי**, **نَا**. In Arabic it is **نَا**, vulgarly *naḵtul, niḵtul, nimsik, nuskut*. In most of the other languages the vowel of the first syllable is weakened; e.g. Eth. *nəngər, nəlbas*; Assyrian *niskun, nišbat*; Aram. **נִי**, **ܢܝܐ**, Mand. **ניִשׁוּב**. The Hebrew alone retains the original *a* with gutturals and in verbs **עָ** and **עָ**, e.g. **נִשְׁמַר**, but **נִשְׁמַר**.

The *dual* number is found, as in the perfect, only in old Arabic and Assyrian; and only in the 3rd and 2nd persons, not in the first. The 3rd pers. masc. in Arabic is **يَقْتُلَانِ**, with the same termination as in the perfect and in substantives. It is represented in Assyrian, according to Sayce, by the form *iskunā, išbatā*, with the loss of the final syllable¹. The corresponding fem. in Arabic is **تَقْتُلَانِ**, to which the Assyrian inscriptions seem to offer no counterpart. The 2nd pers. is likewise **تَقْتُلَانِ**, which form serves for both genders, and is found in Arabic alone.

In conclusion, let me call your attention to the gradual shifting of the accent here, as in the perfect, at least in certain

¹ [Delitzsch regards these forms as plurals.]

forms. The original accentuation appears to me to be that of the classical Arabic, viz. on the first syllable of the 3rd pers. sing. *yáktulu*, in Eth. *yéngēr*. In the lengthened forms of the 2nd sing. fem. and the 3rd and 2nd plur., the Ethiopic threw forward the accent one place, *téngērī*, *yéngērū -rā*, *téngērū -rā*, as compared with the corresponding Arabic *táktulī*, *yáktulū*, *táktulū*; and this accentuation we find in Hebrew in the so-called pausal forms, יִמְשְׁלוּ; תִּתְּנוּ, תִּשְׁמְעוּ, תִּחֲשְׁבוּ; תִּלְכִּי, תִּלְבְּשִׁי, תִּעֲבֹרִי, יִחְדְּלוּ, יִשְׁבוּ; and also in the vulgar Arabic *tiktúlī*, *timsíkī*, *tuskútī*; *tiktúlū*, *timsíkū*, *tuskútū*. Generally speaking, however, the Hebrew, like the Aramaic, shifts the accent to the last syllable, יִקְטֹלוּ, תִּקְטְלוּ, יִקְטְלוּ, יִקְטְלוּ. The forms ending in *ina*, *āna*, are already accented in Arabic on the penult, and the accent remains on the same syllable when it becomes final in Hebrew and Aramaic, תִּקְטְלוּן, יִקְטְלוּן; نَهْضَكُم. So also the Aramaic feminines in *ān*, יִקְטְלוּ, نَهْضَك; whereas the Arabic forms ^{يَقْتُلْنَ} ^{يَقْتُلْنَ} ^{يَقْتُلْنَ}, with the corresponding Hebrew ones, are accented on the penult.

III. *The Imperative.*

Passing on to the imperative mood, I would point out to you its perfect identity in the masc. sing. with the nominal form that constitutes the base of the Arabic imperfect. With substantially the same vowels as in the imperfect, the original forms are *k'tul*, *k'tal* and *k'til*. Nearest to this postulated original stand the Aramaic forms ^{ܕܠܝܬܐ} ^{ܕܠܝܬܐ} ^{ܕܠܝܬܐ}; and the Hebrew ^{נִתֵּן} ^{לִבֶּשׂ} ^{זָכַר} (for ^{נִתֵּן}); in which latter the vowels *u* and *i* are heightened by the tone, as in the imperfect. The Ethiopic *négēr*, *lébas*, show by the accent that more weight was given to the first syllable than in Aramaic and Hebrew; and the same appears to have been the case in Assyrian, where we find the vowel of the first syllable assimilated to that of the second, *šukun*, *šabat*, *rihiš*. The Arabic attained the same intonation by

means of a prosthetic 'alif, with partial assimilation of its vowel to that of the 2nd syllable. Thus, for *k'tul*, the Arab wrote and spoke 'uḳtūl, أَقْتَلْ; for *g'lis*, 'iglis, اجْلِسْ; but for *fraḳ*, he said اِفْرَقْ, 'lfrāḳ, not 'āfrāḳ, because the vowel *a* appeared to him to be too heavy for a merely prosthetic syllable.

As the fem. of *k'tul* we should naturally expect *k'tulīna*, after the analogy of *taḳtūl*, *taḳtūlīna*, in the imperfect; but this full form has been nowhere preserved, except in such rare Syriac forms as ܐܘܝܬܝܢܝܐ or ܐܘܬܝܢܝܐ, e.g. ܐܘܝܬܝܢܝܐ, "remember thou me," ܐܘܬܝܢܝܐ, ܐܘܬܝܢܝܐ, ܐܘܬܝܢܝܐ. As in the imperfect, so here, the final *n* has usually been dropped, e.g. Chald. ܩܬܠܝ; and then the *ī* has disappeared also, as in the Syriac ܩܬܠܐ; Mand. ܩܬܠܐ. In the Talmūd the final ' is retained, at any rate in writing, e.g. ܩܬܠܝ, ܩܬܠܝ. The Ethiopic form is *nǧǧērī*, *lēbāsī*, with shifting of the accent, as we might expect. In the Assyrian forms *šukinī* or *šuknī*, *riḫišī* or *riḫšī*, *šabtī*, the elision of the vowel seems to indicate that the accent remained on the first syllable. The classical Arabic too retains the accent on the prosthetic vowel, 'uḳtūlī, 'iglisī; whereas in vulgar Arabic (Egypt) it is shifted, uḳtūlī, imṣīkī. In Hebrew the forms *k'tūlī*, *k'tālī*, are found in pause, e.g. ܩܬܠܝ, ܩܬܠܝ; but also out of pause, according to the *k'thīb*, in מְלוּכִי Judg. ix. 12, קְסוּמִי I Sam. xxviii. 8. Out of pause, however, the word is commonly modelled somewhat after the form of segolate nouns, and becomes *kuṭlī*, *kaṭlī*; e.g. ܩܬܠܝ, ܩܬܠܝ; but the vowel of the first syllable is mostly weakened to *i*, or even, in certain cases, to *shēvā*; e.g. ܩܬܠܝ, ܩܬܠܝ.

The plural of *k'tul* we should naturally expect, after the analogy of the imperfect, to be *k'tulūna*; and this form is actually found in Syriac, ܩܬܠܝܢܐ. Usually, however, the *n* is dropped,

as in the Chaldee קָטְלוּ; and lastly the final *u* disappears, as in the perfect, leaving in Syriac the form **ܡܬܬܠܐ**, written in Mandaitic without the **ܐܠ**, **ܦܪܘܫ**. The Mandaitic however exhibits a few examples of the full termination *ān*, or even, as in the perfect, *yān*, e.g. **ܐܪܪܘܒܝܢ** (with prosthetic **ܐ**), "lay waste." The final *ā* is also retained before the enclitics, e.g. **ܣܓܘܪܘܠܐ, ܫܒܝܪܘܠܐ**. In Talmudic the *u* is often retained, at any rate in writing, as **ܥܒܪܘ, ܕܠܝܬܘ**. If dropped, it seems in some cases to affect the vowel of the previous syllable, as **ܐܝܡܘܪ** (for **ܐܝܡܪܘ**) or the interjectional **ܐܫܝܪ** ("quick!"). The Ethiopic form is, as we might expect, *nəǧǧērū, lēbāsū*, with shifting of the accent; the Assyrian, *sukinū* or *suknū, riḥiṣū* or *riḥsū, ṣabtū*, were perhaps accentuated on the first syllable, as the elision of the vowel seems to indicate. The old Arabic retains the accent on the prosthetic syllable, *'uḡṭulū, 'iǧlisū*; but the vulgar dialect (Egypt) shifts it, *uḡṭulū, imsīkū*. In Hebrew the forms *k'ṭūlū, k'ṭālū*, appear in pause, as **ܐܚܒܘ, ܫܡܥܘ, ܐܟܠܘ, ܥܒܕܘ, ܐܬܠܘ** (for **ܐܬܠܝܬܘ**). Out of pause, the word is modelled somewhat after the form of segolate nouns, and becomes *kuṭlū, kaṭlū*, as **ܠܚܥܘ, ܐܬܬܥܩܘ, ܡܫܬܠܘ**. Mostly, however, the vowel of the first syllable is weakened to *i*, or even, in certain cases, to *shēvā*; e.g. **ܐܠܠܘ, ܐܬܠܠܘ, ܐܬܠܠܘ, ܐܬܠܠܘ, ܐܬܠܠܘ, ܐܬܠܠܘ**, compared with the pausal **ܐܬܠܠܘ**.

For the 2nd pers. plur. fem. the normal form ought to be *k'ṭulāna*, which appears in Syriac with weakening of the vowel in the last syllable, as **ܡܬܬܠܝܬܐ**. If the *n* be dropped, the vowel disappears with it, leaving **ܡܬܬܠܐ** *k'ṭōl*. But with suffixes the original *ā* is restored, as **ܡܬܬܠܝܬܐ, ܡܬܬܠܝܬܐ**. Similarly, the Ethiopic forms are *nəǧǧērā, lēbāsā*; and the Assyrian, *sukinā* or *suknā, riḥiṣā* or *riḥṣā, ṣabtā*. The Arabic, on the contrary, follows the analogy of the imperfect. As *taḡṭulāna* becomes *taḡṭūlna*, so *k'ṭulāna* becomes **ܐܬܠܠܝܬܐ** *'uḡṭūlna*. This too

is the Hebrew form, רָאִינָה, שְׁמַעְנָה, סִפְרָנָה. In a couple of instances the final נָה (also written ן) is shortened into *n*, viz. שְׁמַעֲנָי Gen. iv. 23, and קִרְאֲנָי Exod. ii. 20; which is in accordance with the vulgar pronunciation of a form like ^{ضربن}, as heard in Palestine by Robinson and Eli Smith, viz. *ḍurubn*.

The dual is to be found in ancient Arabic alone, and its form is analogous to that of the imperfect, viz., 'uḵtulā, for 'uḵtulāni, ḵtulāni. It serves for both genders, like the imperf. taḵtulāni.

IV. *Variations of the Imperfect and Imperative.*

I now proceed to notice sundry variations of the imperfect and imperative, which are used in the Semitic languages to express different shades of meaning, and which correspond in part to the several moods of the Indo-European tongues. As regards the imperfect, it has four such forms, serving as indicative, subjunctive, jussive (cohortative, optative), and energetic; whilst the imperative has two, the simple and the energetic.

It is in the old Arabic alone that these forms appear in full vigour, clearly distinguished by their terminations. The imperfect indicative ends in *u*, *yāḵtulu*; the subjunctive in *a*, *yāḵtula*. The jussive has ordinarily no vowel, *yāḵtul*, but seems originally to have ended in *i*; at least the poets use *yāḵtuli* in rime. Furthermore, the shorter terminations *ī*, *ū*, and *ā* are always substituted for the fuller *īna*, *ūna*, and *āni*, in the fem. sing., the masc. plur., and the dual; *tāḵtulī*, *yāḵtulū*, *yāḵtulā*, not *tāḵtulīna*, *yāḵtulūna*, *yāḵtulāni*. The province of each form is also distinctly marked out. The subjunctive is used in dependent clauses after certain conjunctions, such as ^{أَنَّ} "that," ^{كَيْ} "that," ^{لِ} "that, in order that," ^{حَتَّى} "until," and the like. The jussive serves as an imperative after ^{لَا} "not," as ^{لَا تَقْتُلْ} "do not kill," and after ^{لِ}, as ^{لِيَقْتُلْ} "let him kill" (commonly used in the 3rd pers. only). Preceded by ^{لَمْ} it designates the negative of the past, as ^{لَمْ يَقْتُلْ} "he did not kill." It is also extensively employed in

two correlative conditional clauses, whether actually introduced by the conditional particle ^{اِنْ} "if," or not; e.g. ^{اِنْ تَعْجَلْ تَنْدَمُ} "if thou art hasty, thou wilt repent"; ^{مَنْ يَعْمَلْ سُوءًا يُجْزَ بِهِ} "he who doth evil, shall be recompensed for it."

In such languages as have lost the final vowels, these distinctions are of course no longer clearly obvious. The Aramaic, for example, we may at once dismiss from our observation. In Ethiopic a special form *yēnágēr* is employed for the imperfect indicative; whilst the ordinary *yēngēr* represents the subjunctive and jussive, e.g. ሕዝብህን፡ ብሐር፡ ይዕቀብን፡ (*yēkábka*) "may God preserve thee," ለይኩን፡ ብርሃን፡ "let there be light." Similarly, in Assyrian, if the grammarians may be implicitly trusted, the imperfect indicative is *išákin*; whilst *iškun* has assumed an aoristic sense. Of this fact there appears to be no doubt. In the so-called precativē, however, we see a form exactly corresponding to the Arabic jussive with ^ل and the Ethiopic with ለ; e.g. 3rd pers. *liškun*, *liškunū*, 2nd pers. *lutaškun*, 1st pers. *luškun*.

In Hebrew there is a somewhat closer correspondence to the fullness of the Arabic. If we can no longer distinguish the subjunctive from the indicative, we can at any rate clearly discern the jussive, and perceive that it had originally the same form as in Arabic. This takes place most easily in the Hiph'il of the regular verb, in the Kāl and Hiph'il of verbs ^{ע'ע} and ^{י'ע}, and in the various conjugations of verbs ^{ל'ה}; though there are equally clear cases in the Kāl of some other classes, where the imperfect has *a* or *ē* for its characteristic vowel. The form is used as an optative or an imperative, especially after the negative ^{אֵל}, or in the 3rd pers.; frequently too in correlative conditional clauses, as in Arabic; and lastly, with the so-called *vāv conversivē*. On all these points see your Hebrew Grammar or Mr Driver's treatise on the tenses. Here I shall only seek to illustrate the different forms. If you compare ^{אֵל־תִּשְׁחַת} with ^{תִּשְׁחִית}, or ^{אֵל־יֵאָמֵן} with ^{יֵאָמֵן}, you perceive at once that you have before you two forms corre-

sponding exactly to the Arabic ^{يَقْتُلُ} and ^{يَقْتُلْ}. תַּשְׁחִית or יִמְחֵן is, as I shall explain to you in a subsequent lecture, the equivalent of ^{يَقْتُلُ} with the loss of the final vowel; while תַּשְׁחִית or יִמְחֵן answers to the shorter ^{يَقْتُلْ}, *i* being heightened into *ē* in the tone-syllable. With *vāw conversive* this *ē* may even become *ā*, if the accent be thrown back, as יִסְפֹּךְ from יִסְפֵּךְ. So also in verbs ע"ע, compare יַחַן, יָעוּ, יָסַב, with יִחַן, יִסֵּב, יִסֹּב; יִקוּם, ע"ו with יִפֹּר, יִדַּק, יִפֵּר, יִגֵּן; Hiph'il יִקָּם and יִקָּם; Hiph'il יִבֵּן with יִבֵּן and יִבֵּן; יִסִּיר with יִסֵּר and יִסֹּר. In verbs ל"ה the form is even more marked, if possible: יִשְׁבֶּה but יִשְׁבֵּה; יִרְאֶה but יִרְאֵה; with tone-lengthening, יִשְׁטֶה but יִשְׁטֵה; יִבְכֶּה but יִבְכֵה; יִנְדֶּה but יִנְדֵה; with supplemental vowel, יִחַד but יִחַד; יִחַר but יִחַר; יִגַּל but יִגַּל; יִעַשׂ but יִעַשׂ. In Pi'el יִצְוֶה but יִצְוֶה; יִקְוֶה but יִקְוֶה; יִרְדֶּה but יִרְדֶּה; יִפְתֶּה but יִפְתֶּה; יִנְכֶם but יִנְכֶם; יִגַּל but יִגַּל; יִחַר but יִחַר; יִשְׁקֶה but יִשְׁקֶה; with supplemental vowel, יִרְבֶּה but יִרְבֶּה; יִפְנֶה but יִפְנֶה.

Once more; there exists in Arabic, as I have already told you, an *energetic* or *cohortative* in two shapes, the one with the fuller ending *anna*, the other with the shorter *an*, ^{يَقْتُلُنَّ} and ^{يَقْتُلْنَ}. If we seek after the origin of this termination, we shall perhaps discover it in that demonstrative *n*, which we have already found as a component part of so many pronouns and other demonstratives, such as ^{أَنْ}, ^{هَٰذَا}, ^{هَٰذَا}, ^{هَٰذَا}; and the like. I will not, however, pretend to decide as to the fuller form ^{يَقْتُلُنَّ}, whether it arises from an intensive doubling of the *n* of ^{يَقْتُلْنَ}, or whether, as Stade thinks, it is compounded of ^{يَقْتُلْنَ} and a particle, now lost in Arabic, equivalent in meaning to the Hebrew נָא and

Syriac **ܒܐ**. If the latter be the case, **ܐܩܡܢ** would be exactly equivalent to **ܐܩܡܐ**. Similar is the form in the inscriptions of S. Arabia, as in the tablet: **ܐܩܡܢ ܥܬܬܪ ܕܬܒܪܢܐ**.

These forms, or at any rate the shorter one of the two, have left distinct traces in Hebrew in two ways. (1) In all those forms of the imperfect with pronominal suffixes, where our grammars speak of an *epenthetic nūn* (Kautzsch's *nūn energeticum* or *demonstrativum* is a better term). This *n* is sometimes preserved, as **יְעִבְרֶנּוּ** Jerem. v. 22, **יִצְרְנוּ** Deut. xxxii. 10, **יְבָרְכֶנּוּ** Ps. lxxii. 5, **אֶתְקַנְּךָ** Jerem. xxii. 24, **יִכְבְּדֶנּוּ** Ps. l. 23; but more usually assimilated, as **יַחֲקֶנּוּ**, **יַעֲזֶבְנָה**, **יַעֲזֹבֶךָ**, **יִשְׁמַעְךָ**. Similar forms are in constant use in the Aramaic dialects, though more widely in some than in others, and have even found their way into the perfect with plural suffixes in Mandaitic and Talmudic, as also perhaps in the Syriac form **لِغَاثَمِنَاهِن** = **لَا اَنْتُمْ** = Mand. **لِغَاثَمِنִין** or **لِغَاثَمִין**, though **اَنْتُمْ** may here be the independent pronoun = **הֵמוּ** or **הֵמוֹן** in Biblical Aramaic. In Phœnician this demonstrative *n* occurs also in the suffixes appended to nouns. (2) In the separate forms in **הֵן**. In Arabic **أَتَقُلُّ** may also be written **أَتَقُلَّا**, and is pronounced in pause **أَتَقُلَّا** *aktulā*. Hence is apparent its identity with the Hebrew **אֶתְקַלָּה**. Observe, however, that whilst the form is fully inflected in Arabic, its use is almost restricted in Hebrew to the first person sing. and plur.: **אֶתְקַלָּה**, **אֶתְקַלְּנָה**, **אֶתְקַלְּכֶם**, **אֶתְקַלְּכֶנָּה**; in pause, with older accent, **אֶתְקַלָּה**, **אֶתְקַלְּנָה**, **נֶתְקַלְּכֶם**, **נֶתְקַלְּכֶנָּה**; Very rare are examples in the other persons; e.g., in the 3rd, Ps. xx. 4, Is. v. 19, Ezek. xxiii. 20, Prov. i. 20, viii. 3, Job xi. 17 (where some take **תִּתְקַלְּכֶם** for the 2nd pers. masc.). Of a weakened form in **הֵן** we have two instances; **יִדְשְׁנָה** Ps. xx. 4, and **וְאֶקְרָאָה** 1 Sam. xxviii. 15.

These same energetic forms are also used in the imperative, viz. in Arabic, أَتَقَاتِلْ and أَتَقَاتَلْ. In Hebrew the form in הַ־ is restricted to the 2nd pers. sing. masc., but appears in two shapes.

(1) With the older accentuation, קָטַלְהָ, קָטַלְהָ, from *k'tīlan*, *k'tīlan*; as פָּשַׁטְהָ and הִגְדָּהּ Is. xxxii. 11, מָלוּכָה Judg. ix. 8 (*Kethubh*), צָרַפָּה Ps. xxvi. 2 (*Do.*); שָׁמְעָה, רָגְזָה, יָרָשָׁה; with suffixes שָׁמְעָנָה, קָרָאנָה, תִּנְנָה. (2) More frequently the form is adapted to that of the augmented persons of the imperative, and the accent shifted to the last syllable; e.g. בָּרַתְּהָ, עֲזָבְהָ, שָׁמְרָה, זָכְרָה; or with weakening of the vowel, מְכַרְהָ, עֲרָכְהָ, מְנַצְרָה, שָׁמְעָה. With weakening of הַ־ into ה־ we find דָּעָה in Prov. xxiv. 14, according to one reading, another being דָּעָה.

V. *The Infinitive.*

The *infinitive* of the Semitic languages is in reality nothing but a verbal noun, varying in form according to various modifying influences. In Arabic the grammarians enumerate some forty of these forms in the first conjugation only, though perhaps not more than a dozen or so of these are in common use. In the other languages the number is much smaller. In Ethiopic there are in the first conjugation only two, *uagīr* and *uagīrôt*; in Aramaic but one, מְקַטֵּל, מְסַמְלָא. The Hebrew has likewise two infinitives, one of which, however, appears under several different forms.

Among the commonest infinitives in Arabic are the simple segolates جَبِين : ذِكْرٌ , حِفْظٌ : قَوْلٌ , ضَرْبٌ , as قَتَلَ *katl*, *kītl*, *kutl*, as قَتَلَهُ *kalla*, *kīlla*, *kutla*, as رَحِمَهُ , شَكَرَ : with their rarer feminines سَمَرَةٌ , حَمِيَّةٌ . To these—or still more closely to their Aramaic equivalents [the nominal forms] *k'tal*, *k'til*, *k'tul*—correspond the

forms of the ordinary Hebrew infinitive construct, קָטַל and קָטֹל, with their feminines קָטְלָה or קָטֹלָה, and קָטְלָה or קָטֹלָה. Of these by far the most common is קָטַל, with suffixes קָטַלְי and קָטַלְנִי, קָטַלְךָ or קָטַלְךָ, etc. Of the rarer forms examples are: (1) שָׁלַח, חָסַר, שָׁפַל, שָׁכַב; with suffixes, שָׁכַבְתָּ Gen. xix. 33, בּוֹעֲפּוּ 2 Chron. xxvi. 19, בִּמְעַלְם Ezek. xx. 27, וְעָקַד Is. xxx. 19. (2) אָהַבְתָּ Deut. vii. 8, חָמְלָה Gen. xix. 16, יָרָאָה Is. xxix. 13; שָׁנְאַה Deut. i. 27. (3) עֲצָמָה Is. xlvii. 9, גָּבְהָה Zeph. iii. 11, קָרְבָּה Exod. xxxvi. 2, xl. 32, חָמְלָה Ezek. xvi. 5, חָמְצָה Hos. vii. 4.

The other Hebrew infinitive, the so-called infinitive absolute, has the form *kaṭōl*, as בָּנָה, אָרַר, יָדוּעַ, יָצוּא, הָלוּךְ, נָתַן. Since *ō* in Hebrew ordinarily represents original *a*, this form seems to be identical with the interjectional or imperative form *kaṭāli* قَاتِل in Arabic. As in Hebrew שָׁמֹר means "keep, observe!" or זָכוֹר "remember!" so in Arabic تَرَال means "come down!" or تَرَاك "let alone!"

VI. *The Participles.*

Of the active participle there would appear to have been originally three forms, corresponding to the three forms of the perfect, viz. *katal*, *kaṭil*, and *kaṭul*. The first of these, however, is actually known to us only as a verbal adjective, e.g. חָכֵם, יָשָׁר; unless we except the fem. הָרָה, constr. הִרְתָּ. The other two actually occur as participles: יָגוֹר Jerem. xxii. 25, xxxix. 17 (the only example of this form), מָלֵא, גָּדַל, יָשָׁן, רָעַב, etc. The place of *kaṭal* has been usurped by an intensive form *kaṭāl*, of which we find clear traces in the verbs חוּזָה, לָה, e.g. חוּזָה,

for *həzai* הַזַּי (which actually occurs as a proper name); and in the usual feminine *ḥəṭēleth*, for *ḥəṭalt*, as *יִרְדֶּת*, *יִשָּׁבֶת*, *יִרְעֶת*, in pause *יִשָּׁבֶת*, with suffixes *יִרְדֶּתְכֶם*, *יִשָּׁבֶתְכֶם*; as well as, I think, in such construct forms as *אֲבֵר* Deut. xxxii. 28, *נִטֵּעַ* Ps. xciv. 9. Far more common however than *ḥəṭal* is the form *ḥəṭil*, which may be explained in one of two ways; either as a weakening of *ḥəṭal* by change of *a* in the second syllable into *i*; or as an intensive of the intransitive *ḥəṭil*, the use of which has been gradually extended so as to embrace all classes of verbs. Its oldest form is the Arabic *ḥəṭil*, fem. *ḥəṭilat*, with which closely agree the Ethiopic *ṣādēk*, fem. *ṣādēkt*, and the Assyrian *səkin*, *āsib*, fem. *səkinat*, *āsibat*, as also the Aramaic *קָטַל*, *קָטְלָא*, *קָטְלִי*, *קָטְלִי*. In the Biblical Aramaic this participle is pointed, at least in pause, *קָטַל*, e.g. Dan. iv. 10, vi. 3, vii. 9, but also iii. 17, iv. 20, 34. In the same dialect the feminine and plurals have moveable *shēvā*, e.g. *קָטְלָא* Ezr. iv. 24, *קָטְלָא* Dan. v. 5, *קָטְלָא* Ezr. iv. 17, *קָטְלָא*; whereas in Syriac the *shēvā* is silent, *קָטַל*, whence it comes that in later Jewish Aramaic [and in some Hebrew Bibles] we often find *pathach* in the first syllable, though incorrectly. The moveable *shēvā* is of course the older form, coinciding with the moveable *shēvā* of the Hebrew, and the full vowel *i* of the Arabic *ḥəṭilūna*, *ḥəṭilatūna*. The Hebrew form naturally substitutes *ō* for *a* in the 1st syllable, and heightens the vowel of the tone-syllable into *e*, whence *קָטַל*, fem. *קָטְלָא*, in certain cases with fuller vowel *קָטְלָא*, *קָטְלָא*.

In regard to the passive participle, the Semitic languages diverge from one another more than is usual. Of the passive voice generally I shall treat at another opportunity. At present it must suffice to say that the participial form ordinarily employed in Arabic is *maḥṭul*, with the prefix *ma*, of which I shall have more to say when we come to the derived conjugations of the verb. The Hebrew form *ḥəṭul*, *קָטַל*, is very common in Ethiopic, but with the first vowel weakened, *ḥəṭul*, fem. *ḥəṭēlt*,

e.g. *ṣḥūf* "written," *ʿsūr* "bound," *mǝlū* "full," fem. *ṣḥūft*, *ʿsért*, *mǝlǝʿt*. The Arabic form **فَعُول** is also sometimes used in a passive sense, e.g. **رَكُوبَةٌ** "a she camel for riding," **حَلُوبَةٌ** "a she camel for milking." In Syriac too there are a few examples of this kind, as **ܢܬܡܠܐ**, **ܢܬܡܠܐ**, "beloved," **ܡܬܬܠܐ**, **ܡܬܠܐ**, "hated," **ܡܬܬܠܐ** "a thing stolen," **ܡܬܬܠܐ** "a thing heard, a rumour." In Aramaic however the form **ܡܬܬܠܐ**, **ܡܬܬܠܐ** is preferred, which is identical with the Arabic adjective *ḡatīl*: e.g. **ܐܣܝܪܐ ܕܗܝܝܐ ܩܬܝܠܐ**. Of another verbally inflected *ḡatīl* in Aramaic I shall attempt an explanation when we come to the passive voice.

VII. *The Derived Conjugations.*

A. *First Group.*

I next proceed to speak briefly of the more important of the derived conjugations.

These are divisible into groups, the members of which closely resemble one another in their inflexion. The first group consists of three: (a) an intensive and iterative or frequentative; (b) a form expressive of effort, with an implied idea of reciprocal effort; and (c) a factitive or causative.

1. The first of these, the intensive and iterative, finds its expression in the doubling of the second consonant of the root. You may remember that intensive nouns are formed in the same way; that a word of the form *ḡatāl*, like **ܡܬܬܠܐ** or **ܡܬܬܠܐ**, becomes *ḡatṭāl*, like **ܡܬܬܠܐ** or **ܡܬܬܠܐ**. Now as the nominal *ḡatāl* lies at the root of the verbal form *ḡatālā*, so does the nominal *ḡatṭāl* at the root of the verbal *ḡatṭālā*.

The Arabic, as usual, exhibits this form in its primitive integrity, *ḡattala*: **قَتَلَ** "to kill many, to massacre"; **كَسَرَ** "to break into many pieces"; **بَكَى** "to weep much" or "constantly"; **مَوَتَ**

“to die in great numbers”; طَوَّفَ “to go round and round.” So in Ethiopic, ረሰዖ: *rassáya*, “to do”; ረሰዐ: *faundáya*, “to send”; ረሰዐ: *saucéya*, “to call out” (where the vowel of the 2nd syllable is modified by the final guttural). In Hebrew the original form was, of course, *kattál*; but as in the noun we find אָכַר for אֶכֶר, so in the verb *kittál* for *káttál*, as גָּדַל, אָכַר, שָׁכַר, רָחַם, אָרַשׁ “betroth to oneself.” The *ā* of the 2nd syllable is sometimes weakened to *ē*, as in דָּבַר, נָפַר, נָפַס (with which compare the change of *ā* into *ē* in גָּבַר for גֶּבַר); but far more usually into *i*, more especially in pause, where it appears, owing to the force of the tone, as *ē*—̄. This change is probably owing to the influence of the vowel of the same syllable in the imperfect and imperative (קָטַל, יִקְטֹל). In the first and 2nd persons the original short *ā* is dominant, דִּבַּרְתִּי, דִּבַּרְתָּם, דִּבַּרְתָּ, דִּבַּרְתְּ, דִּבַּרְנוּ. In the pausal forms of the 3rd pers. sing. fem., and the 3rd pers. plur., the weaker vowel predominates: לָקְטָהּ, גָּדְלָהּ, שָׁכְרוּ, דִּבְרוּ, though we also find קָבְצָה Micah i. 7. In the Aramaic dialects the weakened קָטַל, קָטַל, קָטַל prevails, except where a guttural, or the letter *ṣ*, as 3rd radical, may have protected the original vowel; e.g. יָכַח, יָכַח.

Glancing at the imperative, imperfect, and participle, we observe that in all the Semitic languages the vowels of the root-syllables are *a* in the first and *i* in the second, *kattil*. So the imperative in Arabic, كَاتِلْ *kattil*; in Ethiopic, ረሰመ: *fāṣṣēm*; in Hebrew, דִּבֵּר, בִּקֵּשׁ; in Syriac, ܕܒܪܐ, ܩܬܐ. The nominal form *kattil*, intensified to *káttil*, lies at the root of the verbal form. Hence it appears that the use of *ā* in the case of radicals 3rd guttural, like שָׁכַח, שָׁכַח, שָׁכַח, is due, not to the retention of the original vowel under the protection of the guttural, but to a later change of *i*, *ē*, into *ā* under the influence of that

guttural. Side by side with שִׁמַּח לְבִי, Prov. xxvii. 11, we have שִׁמַּח נַפְשׁ עַבְדְּךָ; and the pausal forms of the fem. and plur. are always דִּבְרוּ, דִּבְרוּ, not דִּבְרִי, דִּבְרֵי.

The imperfect is formed and inflected on precisely the same principles as in the first or simple conjugation. The vowel of the preformatives was originally *ā*, yielding the forms *yakāṭṭilu*, *takāṭṭilu*, etc. This pure vowel I find, however, only in the Ethiopic subjunctive of verbs 1st guttural, e.g. *Ṗḥ.ḫ.ḥ*: *yakāddēs*. Otherwise it is weakened into *ē*, as *yēfaššēm*, *፪፩፪፩*. In Arabic this dull obscure vowel appears in the classical language as *ī*, e.g. *يَقْتُلُ*, *يَقْتُلُ*; and the same is the case in Assyrian, where we have the forms *yušakkin*, *tušakkin*, etc. In vulgar Arabic Spitta gives the preformative the vowel *i*, whilst the vowel of the final syllable varies according to the nature of the last radical, *yīšaddaq*, *yīfattaḥ*, but *yīkallim*, *yīrattib*. In Hebrew and Aramaic the preformative vowel is also *ē*, *יִקְטֹל*, *יִמְצֵא*, save that in the 1st pers. sing. *ʾē* appears in Hebrew and *ʾa* in Aramaic, *אֶדְבֵּר*, *אֶמְצֵא*. As, in the 1st conj., the Ethiopic exhibits two varieties of the imperfect, one serving for the indicative, the other for the subjunctive and jussive, so here in the 2nd conj. In the 1st conj., however, the distinction was easily made, and effected by a mere change of the vocalisation; *yēnāgēr* for the indicative, *yēngēr* for the subjunctive, corresponding in form at least to the Assyrian *išākin* and *iškun*. But here, in the 2nd conj., some further change is necessary, because of the double letter, which renders any mere vowel change almost impossible without entirely destroying the normal form. The Ethiopic therefore retained the normal *yēfāššēm* for the subjunctive, and had recourse for the indicative to the form *yēfēšēm*, *፪፩፪፩*, the origin of which is not perfectly clear. That the doubling of the 2nd radical has been dropped is certain; and therefore it seems most likely that the form *kaitāla* has been resorted to, which would naturally appear in Ethiopic as *kētāla*.

The active participle follows exactly the same vocalisation. Its preformative in Ethiopic is *ma*, e.g. *፳፬፻፳፭*: *maʾammēz*,

מַכְזִנֵּן: *makẕannēn*. The Hebrew and Aramaic weaken the vowel to *ē*, מַכְזֵּר, مَكْزَل; and this dull vowel is represented in old Arabic and Assyrian by *u*, مَكْزَل, *mušakkin*, in modern Arabic by *ē*, as *mēfattah*, *mēsaddak*, *mēkammil*, *mē'allim*.

The infinitive of this conj. also calls for a few remarks. Beginning with the Hebrew, we find the ordinary or construct infin. to be קָטַל, *kattél*, from an original *kattil*. The weakening of the 1st vowel to *i* is a rarity, as חָלַץ Levit. xiv. 43, קָטַר Jerem. xlv. 21; נָשַׁל Deut. xxxii. 35¹. Compare in the class of concretes such words as עָוַר, גָּבַן, from *gabbín*, 'arvir. The same form *kattél* serves for the infin. absolute (with weakening נָיִן 2 Sam. xii. 14); but with it occurs another, viz. קָטַל, e.g. בָּרוּךְ, רָפָא, יָפַר, קָנָא. The corresponding concretes are exemplified by רִתּוּק "chain," קָנָוּא "zealous, jealous," or, with weakening of the 1st vowel, מְלוּא, גְּבוּר, נְשׁוּר, יְפוּר (Job xl. 2 = xxxix. 32), קָפָוּ (قَفَاوَة). These all spring from an original *kattil*, the intensive of קָטַל, قَتَلَ. The Arabic infin. قَتَلَ is

therefore weakened from ⁵قَدَّال, as in ⁵كَذَاب, ⁵عَلَام, ⁵حِمَال, as compared with the concretes ⁵كَذَاب, ⁵عَلَام, ⁵حِمَال. --The forms with prefixed *t*, which are generally assigned to this conjugation, ⁵تَعْدَال, ⁵تَعْتِيل, ⁵تَعْنَل, we shall explain elsewhere.—In Aramaic the forms of the infinitive diverge somewhat from one another. The Aramaic of the Bible and the Targūms generally has the form ⁵קַטְלָא (קַטְלָה): whilst the Talmūd Bablī, the Mandaitic, and the modern Syriac, exhibit ⁵קַטְלוּ; e.g. Talm. B. ⁵נִשְׁבְּחוּ.

¹ [Kautzsch-Ges. (25th ed., p. 143) recognises only two certain examples of the infinitive const. with *i* in the first syllable, viz. Lev. xiv. 43 and 1 Chron. viii. 8, and in both the text is open to question; see *Journ. of Phil.* xvi. 72. In 2 Sam. xii. 14 the inf. abs. יִשְׁכֵּךְ seems to be influenced by the sound of the following word מִשְׁכָּךְ.]

שאבוחיא, אסוייא, נאטוריא, בארוניא; Mand. צלויי, אפויי;
 mod. Syr. ܦܢܝܐ, ܦܢܝܐ. This ܦܢܝܐ is not easy to explain,
 but most likely, as Noeldeke thinks, it is connected with such
 Hebrew forms as שָׁבַל (plur. שְׁבָלִים, Is. xlix. 20) and שָׁלוֹם,
 plus the originally fem. termination *ai*, which we find in Syriac in
 ܡܫܬܒܐ, ܡܫܬܒܐ, etc. In all these dialects an *m* is occasionally
 prefixed, Targ. ܡܫܬܒܐ, Mand. ܡܫܬܒܐ, mod. Syr. ܡܫܬܒܐ,
 ܡܫܬܒܐ; and this is the ordinary form in old Syriac, but with a
 different termination, though also originally fem., viz. ܡܫܬܒܐ.
 The prefixing of the *m* may have been due to the influence
 of the participial forms, and of the infin. Pē'al, ܡܫܬܒܐ. — In
 Mandaitic and modern Syriac a fem. of ܦܢܝܐ is also in common
 use as a verbal noun or infinitive, viz. ܦܢܝܐ, as ܦܢܝܐ
 “order,” ܦܢܝܐ “provocation,” ܦܢܝܐ “selling,” ܦܢܝܐ
 “warning”; ܦܢܝܐ “completion,” ܦܢܝܐ “deliverance.” The
 most nearly corresponding forms in Hebrew are represented by
 such words as ܦܢܝܐ “desiring,” ܦܢܝܐ “care,” ܦܢܝܐ “terror,”
 ܦܢܝܐ “cutting off (of rain), drought, distress,” ܦܢܝܐ “punish-
 ment,” ܦܢܝܐ “drought.” These are intensives of the form
 ܦܢܝܐ ܦܢܝܐ ܦܢܝܐ *ḥatāṭā*, found in old Syriac and still more abundantly in
 mod. Syriac, ܦܢܝܐ, ܦܢܝܐ, ܦܢܝܐ: just as ܦܢܝܐ is the
 intensive of the Syr. and Mand. ܦܢܝܐ, ܦܢܝܐ, ܦܢܝܐ.

2. The second verbal form in this group is that which
 expresses an effort, with the implied idea of a counter-effort.
 Its expression lies in the lengthening of the vowel of the first
 syllable, *ḥātala* instead of *ḥatala*. It is in general use in Arabic
 only, but examples occur in Ethiopic too, the form being
 identical in both languages, viz. ܦܢܝܐ, ܦܢܝܐ: “bless”; ܦܢܝܐ
 “go to law”; ܦܢܝܐ “talk to”; ܦܢܝܐ, ܦܢܝܐ: “play the hypocrite.”


In Hebrew its use is likewise restricted. It appears in this language under the shape of *kāṭal*, for *kāṭāl*, and is most common in verbs ע"ע, e.g. פִּוֶּרַר "cleave," חוּלַל "pierce, wound," חוּנַן "show mercy," סוּבַב "surround," הוּלַל "befool," רוּצֵן "crush to bits." In the ordinary triliteral verb examples are rare, but certain: e.g. לוֹשֵׁן (מִשְׁכֵּמִי = *ṣaḥakimī*) (Job ix. 15, שׁוּפַט (Ps. ci. 5, מְלוֹשְׁנִי בַּפֶּתַר רִעְהוּ (Hos. xiii. 3, סוּעַר "blows away"), הוּרַו וְהוּגוּ "to take root," "conceiving and uttering," Is. lix. 13. In Aramaic this form can hardly be said to occur, save in Biblical Aramaic, where we find מְסוּבְלִין "set up," Ezra vi. 3. The inflexion runs entirely parallel to that of the intensive form, and therefore requires no special elucidation. I will merely remark as to the Arabic infinitive that the original form is *kāṭāl*, of which the grammarians quote one or two examples, as *قَاتَلُ* and *قَاتَلُ*. Usually, however, it has been shortened into *قَاتَلُ*, though some compensated for the loss of the long vowel by doubling the middle radical, *قَاتَلُ*, which must however have led to confusion with the infinitive of the intensive. The Hebrew infinitives הוּרַו and הוּגוּ hold fast the original vowel *ā*, and would be represented in Arabic by some such words as *قَاتَلُ* and *هَاجَأُ*, which do not actually exist.

As to the participle I would remark that an example without prefixed *m* seems to offer itself in the word עוֹנִין 1 Sam. xviii. 9 (*Kēthibh* עוֹן), for the corresponding Arabic verb is *عَانِنَ*. We shall have occasion hereafter to notice other participial forms in Hebrew and modern Syriac without prefixed *m*.

And here I may call your attention in passing to another verbal form in Hebrew, which is in some cases identical in

preformative הַ, *sa*, more frequently אֶה, *as*, is an ordinary causative prefix, e.g. הָנִיחַ: "be honoured," אֲהַנְּתָם: "honour." In Assyrian such forms as *ušaškin*, "set up," *ušaṣriš*, "spread out," *ušašbit*, "let seize," seem to be common. In Biblical Hebrew, on the other hand, the prefix שׁ is found only in the derivative nouns שְׂלֵהֶב "flame," [from Aram. שְׁלֵהֶב "kindle"], שְׂקַעְרֻרוֹת (Levit. xiv. 37), "hollows, depressions," (rad. קער), and שְׂפִילָה "snail," (rad. בִּלָּה "moisten," בָּל). In the Aramaic dialects, on the contrary, there are numerous examples of it, such as שְׂכִילָה, מְשַׁלֵּב, מְשַׁמֵּד, מְשַׁחֵם, מְשַׁחֵם, מְשַׁחֵם, מְשַׁחֵם. The form with ס is far more rare, e.g. סְקִיבָה, סְקִיבָה; Syr. سَكَبَ, سَمَحَ, سَمَحَ (rad. سَكَب); Mand. סארהיב, סאסקיל "smooth."—This initial *s* underwent, however, in most cases, a further change into *h*. Hence some rare Arabic forms like هَاتِ "give," هَرَّاقَ "pour out," هَرَّادَ "wish," حَرَاحَ "let rest," (for أَتِ, imperative of أَتَى from أَتَى "come"). This *h* does not occur in Ethiopic or Assyrian, but we find it in one of the Ilimyaritic dialects, הקני, ההרת. In Biblical Aramaic it is common, in the forms הקטל, הקטל; and may also be found in the Targūms, at least in verbs פֿון and פֿין. In Mandaic there are likewise a few instances, e.g. האוליל "cry out, lament"; האשיט "despise"; האנפיק "lead out," and האנסיק "let ascend," as well as אפיק and אסיק. In Syriac it is unknown²; but it is the usual form in Hebrew. Here the original was *hakatal*, with *a* in both syllables. For the first syllable this is proved (1) by the vowel of the imperative and imperfect, and (2) by the forms of verbs פֿין, where הושיב, הוריש can only

¹ [שכלל and שיזב appear to be of Assyrian origin. N.]

² [The solitary form , was regarded by Prof. Wright as a loan-word from the Hebrew.]

arise from הָוִישׁ, הָוִישִׁב. For the second syllable the *a* is established (1) by the vowel of the 1st and 2nd persons, הָקִטְלָתִי, הָקִטְלָה, etc., and (2) by the form הָגִלָּה for הָגִלִּי, in verbs לִיץ or לִיץ. The vowel of the first syllable was however mostly weakened into *i*, and that of the second into *ē*. In the second syllable we should naturally expect = *ē*, but the language has in this case gone a step further and sunk *ē* into *ī*. Hence the normal הָקִטְלִי, with its fem. הָקִטְלִיָּה and plur. הָקִטְלִיּוֹ. The rest of the paradigm does not call for much remark. The imperfect יִקְטִיל is a contraction for יִהְקִטִּיל, of which fuller form examples occur in Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic. The normal *ē* is retained in Hebrew in the jussive יִקְטֵל, the infinitive absolute הִקְטֵל, and the imperative הִקְטֵל and הִקְטִילָּה (הִקְטִילָּה in Gen. iv. 23); but the long *ē* appears in the heavier forms of the imperfect יִקְטִיל, the energetic יִקְטִילָּנוּ, הִקְטִילָּה, the imperative הִקְטִילִּי, הִקְטִילִּי, and the participle מִקְטִיל. The infinitive construct varies between הִקְטִיל and הִקְטִיל, though the former is much more common. A form like הִשְׁמִיר, Deut. vii. 24, xxviii. 48, is a rarity¹.

The last step in the history of the factitive or causative is the weakening of the initial *h* into the spiritus lenis. In Phœnician the perfect is written with initial *ʿ*, but was probably pronounced *ikʿtāl*. Examples from the inscriptions are יִטְנָא 'he set up,' and יִקְדֵּשׁ 'he consecrated.' This weakening is almost universal in Arabic, where the form is written أَكْتَل *ʾaktala*². In Ethiopic too it is exceedingly common: and the prefix 'a is used in this language to form causatives not merely from *kātāla*, but also from *kattāla*, and even from *kātāla*: as ጸጸለ: "come," ለጸጸለ: "bring"; ሐረ: "go," ለሐረ: "make to go"; ሠነዖ: *san-nāya*, "be beautiful," ለሠነዖ: *ʾasannāya*, "make beautiful": ለፈጸመ:

¹ [Indeed, the genuineness of such forms is doubtful; see *Journ. of Phil.* xvi. 72.]

² In vulgar Arabic one hears *islam* for *aslam*, "he has become a Muslim," but this is a rare exception.

"make one finish"; Ἀλφὴ: "condole with one." In Tigrīna and Amharic too it is in ordinary use. In Hebrew it is very rare (אַנְאַלְתִּי "I have defiled," Is. lxiii. 3; אֲשַׁבֵּים, infin., Jerem. xxv. 3); but in the Aramaic dialects it is the almost universal form, אַלְלָא. In one instance in Syr. the vowel of the 1st syllable is weakened to *ä*, viz. اَوَصَد, as compared with اَشَبَح, اَشَبَحَ, — like the vulg. Arab. اسلم mentioned above. With regard to the initial *a*, I may remark that it disappears after preformatives; e.g. in Arabic, يَقْتُل, part. مَقْتُل; in Ethiopic, from ለንገረ: "make speak," ያንገር: *yānágǝr* and ያንገር: *yāngǝr*; Syr. اَصَلَا. اَصَلَا. The vulgar Arabic of Egypt has weakened the vowel of the 1st syllable to *i*, as يِكْخَبِر (يَخْبِر), *yimhil* (يَمِيل). In the Aramaic dialects, the infinitive of Aph'el exhibits nearly the same varieties as that of Pa'el. The Biblical and Targumic form is אֲקַטְלָא, אֲקַטְלָא, corresponding very nearly to the Arabic اَقْتَلَّ: Talm. Babli and Mandaitic, אֲקַטְלִי, as אַחֲוִי; אַחֲוִי; אַרְבּוּנָא "kneel," אַנּוּרִיא "condemn"; with prefixed *m*, מַאסְנִיָא "go," מַאיתוּיָא "bring"; Syriac, always with *m*, مَصْلَحَة.

B. Second Group.

The 2nd group of derived conjugations consists of four members, serving originally as reflexives and reciprocals of the previous four, but often also as passives. The sign which is common to the whole of them is the prefixed syllable *ta*. This, whatever may have been its primitive form and derivation, must originally have been quite different from the causative prefix *ta*, of which we spoke above.

1. The reflexive of the first conjugation is *taḵátala*. Of this

we have two varieties in Ethiopic, ተከረኒ: *takadāna*, and ተከረኒ: *takādna*, "cover oneself, be covered"; ተዐቀበ: and ተዐቅበ: "guard oneself, abstain, beware, be guarded"; ተወልደ: "be born"; ተሸላዘ: "be taken"; ተሰሐሐ: or ተሰሐ: "be angry." In course of time the prefixed *ta* would lose its vowel, and take a prosthetic vowel instead, becoming firstly *i*, and then *'it* or *'ith*. Hence the Aramaic form, אֶתְקַטַּל, more commonly, with weakening of the last vowel, אֶתְקַטִּיל, אֶתְקַטִּיל. In Syriac and Mandaitic we also find a supplementary vowel in frequent use, عَتِיקَتِيل, اِئْتَمَل. The Biblical Aram. has the spiritus asper instead of the lenis, הֶתְקַטַּל, e.g. הֶתְרַחֲצִי Dan. iii. 28. In Hebrew this form is of very rare occurrence indeed. A possible example, without any prosthetic, may be תַּחַרַּה, of which the imperf. תִּתְחַרֵּה occurs in Jerem. xii. 5, and the participle מִתְחַרֵּה in xxii. 15. If so, this form is next of kin to the Syr. اِئْتَمَل. More certain is a derivative from the rad. פָּקַד, with the prosthetic spiritus asper, viz. הֶתְפַּקֵּד "to be numbered, mustered," e.g. Judges xx. 15, 17, xxi. 9, which is written without *daghesh* and with *kāmeṣ* wherever it occurs¹. The Arabic form اِفْتَتَلَ, standing for قَتَلَ, offers us the curious feature of a transposition of the preformative to the place after the first radical, قَتَلَ for اِفْتَتَلَ. This began no doubt with the verbs which commenced with a sibilant, as in Syr. اِئْتَمَل, اِئْتَمَل; اِئْتَمَل, اِئْتَمَل; and was gradually extended to all alike. The Arabic parallel to הֶתְפַּקֵּד is therefore اِفْتَقَد "to search for, inspect." Curiously enough the same transposition seems to have existed in Moabitic; at least in the inscription of king Mēsha' we find four times (ll. 11, 15, 19, 32) a form הֶלְתַּחַם, from the rad. לָחַם, in the

¹ The pronunciation as a passive הֶתְפַּקְרוּ, Num. i. 47, ii. 33, xxvi. 62; 1 Kings xx. 27, is probably due to a misunderstanding of the Massoretes.

sense of the Heb. **נָלַחַם** "fight," Arab. **التَّحَمَّ** "join oneself to, adhere to," "rage" (of a battle). It is also found in Assyrian, as *istakan* "he made," *iftikid* "he committed" or "entrusted"; and in Hġmyaritic, without any prosthetic *alif*, e.g. **כְּתַמַּר** from **כְּתַר**, **כְּתַאֲל** from **כְּתַל**, **נְתַדַּר** from **נְדַר**. It would appear that forms without transposition of the *t*, as well as forms corresponding to those of classical Arabic, exist in the modern dialect of Egypt. At least Spitta distinguishes carefully verbs of the form *itfa'al* or *itfi'il* from the corresponding forms of the intensive with double radical. According to him *itfa'al* or *itfi'il* is usually passive of Conj. I, as *itħabas*, *itkasar*, *itmisik*, *itfihim*; whereas the transposed *iftawal* is more usually reflexive than passive, as *itamad*, *intazar*, *iřtalah*, *iřtama'* ("be heard" and "obey").

2. The reflexive of the intensive and iterative is naturally *taġattala*. This form presents itself in Arabic, **تَتَقَلَّل**, and in Ethiopic, **ተቀደሰ**: *taġaddāsa*, "be hallowed," **ተፈጸመ**: *tafařřama*, "be finished," **ተላዘዘ**: *ta'azzāza*, "obey," **ተፈለለ**: *tafařřella*, "rejoice" (because of the 3rd guttural). It would gradually be corrupted into **ተቀጠለ** *itġattala*, of which we find examples even in classical Arabic, especially when the verb begins with a dental or sibilant, when assimilation takes place, as **ادثر** "wrap oneself up in a garment," **ازين** "adorn oneself," **اسمع** "hear, listen," **اصعد** "ascend," **اصدق** "give alms," **اطير** "regard as an evil omen." In this way **تنفس** would become **اتنفس**, and so in vulg. Arabic **اتعلق** *it'allak*, "be suspended," **اتنظف** *itnadđaf*, "be cleansed," or with weakening of the 3rd vowel, **اتعمم**, *it'ammim*, "put on a turban." Here we have the origin of the Aramaic **אתקטל**, Syr. **ܐܬܩܬܠ**, in Bibl. Aram. **ܐܬܩܬܠ**, as **ܐܬܩܬܠ** Ezra vii. 15,

v. 17, Dan. iv. 12, 20, 30, etc.; with weakening of the last vowel, הוֹדְמָנְתָּן, Dan. ii. 9 (*Ḳēre*); as well as of the Hebrew form הִתְקַטַּל or הִתְקַטֵּל. The assimilation of which I spoke above as occurring even in classical Arabic, is common in most of the dialects. In Arabic a word like اَدْرَ makes in its imperfect يَدْرُ for يَدْتَرُ. Just so in Ethiopic, from verbs with initial dentals and sibilants, we have in this and in the preceding conjugation, such forms as ይጠጥቅ: from ተጠጥቀ: “be dipped, baptized”; ይደፈን: from ተደፋን: “be covered, buried”; ይሰበር: from ተሰበር: “be broken”; ይጻጻፍ: from ተጻጸፈ: “be written”; ይዜስር: from ተዘስር: “remember”; ይጸደቅ: from ተጸደቀ: “pretend to be righteous.” In Tigrīña this assimilation extends to all verbs, ይገደፋ: “it will be forgiven,” from ተገደፋ:; ይ.ሶስስ: “he returns,” from ተሶስሱ:; ይፋጸመ: “it will be finished,” from ተፋጸሙ:; ይቅበል: “he receives,” from ተቀበሌ:; Indeed the doubling caused by the assimilation of the preformative seems to have been gradually dropped in pronunciation, and these words are now pronounced *yēgēḍaf*, *yēmēlas*, *yēfēṣam*, *yēkēbal*. Hence Hebrew forms like הִתְהַרְהַר, הִתְהַרְהַר, הִתְהַרְהַר, are at once explained, as well as the similar הִתְהַרְהַר. In Mandaitic and the Talmūd this assimilation is as common in both conjugations as in Tigrīña. E.g. in Mandaitic, not merely עֲדָגָר “were heaped up” (עֲתֵדָגָר), מִפְתָּא “were stopped up” (עֲתֵמָא), but also מִפְתָּא “opened” (מִתְפְּתָח), מִיבִיא “wanted” (מִתְבַּעֵי), מִיגִטִּיל “killed” (מִתְקַטֵּל); עֲנָאֲאֵשׁ “was fulfilled,” עֲנָאֲאֵשׁ “was collected,” מִכָּאֲלָא “crowned”; in the Talmūd, מִיבִעֵי, מִיגִנִּיב, מִקְטִיל, מִיפְלִגִּי for מִתְפַּלְגִּין, מִיבִסֵּא, אִיבִסֵּא “cover thyself” (fem.). and apparently with suppression of the doubling, אִיעֶסַק “he gave himself the trouble,” אִיעֶלְמָא “she hid herself,” אִיעֶתְרִי “I am become

rich." Similar phenomena occur in Samaritan; and even in Hebrew we have at least one similar instance in the word **אֶרֶם**, Is. xxxiii. 10.

Yet again, the Ithpēl and Ithpa^al forms have a peculiarity common to them in several of the dialects. This is, that when the first radical is a sibilant, the preformative is transposed and appears in the 2nd place, as is always the case with the Arabic **اِفْتَعَلَ**. Frequently too the **ת** is changed into a **ט** or a **ך**, according to the character of the initial consonant of the root. So in Hebrew, **הִשְׁתַּחֲוֹת**, **הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה**, but **הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה**. So in Syriac, **ܐܬܗܠܥܕ**, **ܐܬܗܠܥܕܐ**, but **ܐܬܗܠܥܕܐ**, **ܐܬܗܠܥܕܐ**. So in Arabic, in the conj. **اِصْطَبَحَ**, **زَادَ** from **ازداد**, **زَجَرَ** from **ازدجر**, **اِفْتَعَلَ** from **اضطر**. In Arabic the assimilation of the two letters is the rule when the first radical is **ث**, **د**, **ذ**, or **ظ**, and it may take place either backwards or forwards; thus from **ثَارَ** Lane gives **اِثَّارَ**; from **اَتَرَدَ** and **اِتَرَدَ**, "crumble bread"; from **اِثَّغَرَ** and **اِثَّغَرَ**, "cut the front teeth"; from **اِدَّرَعَ** and **اِدَّرَعَ**, "put on mail"; from **اِدَلَّجَ** and **اِدَلَّجَ**, "journey by night"; from **اَذَّكَّرَ** and **اَذَّكَّرَ**, rather than **اَذَّكَّرَ** and **اَذَّكَّرَ**, but from **اَذَّكَّرَ** and **اِظْفَرَ**, **اِظْفَرَ**, **اِظْفَرَ**; **اِظْفَرَ** or **اِظْفَرَ** from **اِظْفَرَ** and **اِظْفَرَ**; **اِظْفَرَ** and **اِظْفَرَ**. With initial **ص** and **ض** this assimilation is far less common, as **اِصْبَحَ**, **اِصْبَحَ**, **اِصْبَحَ**; and with **س** and **ز** it is very rare, as **اِزَّانَ**, **اِزَّانَ**. Bearing these facts in mind, we are, I think, justified in saying that a Hebrew form

like הִכְדוּ (Is. i. 16) is assimilated from הִדְדוּ, just as the similar תִּשְׁתּוּמִּים (Eccles. vii. 16) stands for תִּשְׁתּוּמִּים, with backward assimilation. Similarly in Syriac, ܬܬܠܠܐ for ܬܠܠܐ, ܬܬܠܠܐ for ܬܠܠܐ, ܬܬܠܠܐ for ܬܠܠܐ. Here and there we find exceptions to the rule of transposition. In Aramaic the verb ܐܬܬܐܝܢܐ exhibits the forms ܐܬܬܐܝܢܐ (in Euting's *Nabataische Inschriften aus Arabien*, no. 11) and ܐܬܬܐܝܢܐ in the great Tariff of Palmyra (*Journ. Asiat.* 1883, Aug. Sept., p. 165), A.D. 137 (last year of Hadrian). The solitary Hebrew example will be spoken of below (p. 213).

3. After all that I have said about the forms اَقْتَتَلَ and تَقَاتَلَ, the third member of this group requires but little notice. It is the reflexive and reciprocal of *kātala*, viz. *taḳātala*, which is the ordinary Arabic form, as تَرَايَ “to throw oneself down,” تَمَارَضَ “to pretend to be sick,” تَقَاتَلُوا “they fought with one another.” So in Ethiopic, ተላፀዖ: or ተላፀዖ: “to shave oneself,” ተላሀሀሰ: “to show oneself gentle to another, pardon,” ተፋለጡ: “they parted from one another,” ተላቀዖ: “he was tortured, afflicted.” But تَقَاتَلَ gradually became اتَقَاتَلَ, and hence such forms in classical Arabic as اتَّابَعَ “rush headlong,” اتَّقَلَ “be heavy and troublesome,” اِدَّارَا “repel one another,” اِسَاقَطَ. In the vulgar Arabic of Egypt the vowel of the 3rd syllable is weakened to *i* or to *shēva*, as *itkāmīl*, *itārik* “struggled with,” *itāradū*, *itnāsabū*. In Biblical Aramaic occurs the form ܐܬܬܐܝܢܐ, Dan. iv. 16. In Hebrew we may regard הִתְנַעַץ “stagger to and fro, toss itself,” Jer. xxv. 16, xlv. 7, 8; and מִנְאִין, Is. lii. 5, for מִתְנַאֵץ, “blasphemed,” as examples from the ordinary triliteral verb. From verbs עָע I may mention הִתְעוּלֵל “perpetrate,

accomplish," Ps. cxli. 4; הִתְפַּוֵּר Is. xxiv. 19; הִתְרוֹצֵץ Gen. xxv. 22; הִתְקוֹשֵׁשׁ Zeph. ii. 1; and הִתְהוֹלֵל. And here I will notice in passing one curious Hebrew form, though it does not belong to the conjugation תִּקְטֹל, but to תִּקְטֹל. From the radical שׁוּט is derived the Pi'lēl שׁוּטִיט, "wander about," and from this the Prophet Jeremiah has formed the Hithpa'lēl הִתְשׁוּטִיטָה, in the imperat. plur. fem. הִתְשׁוּטִיטָה, Jer. xlix. 3. It is the solitary instance that I know in Hebrew of the ת not being transposed with an initial sibilant; and the reason probably was to avoid the sequence of three *t*'s, הִשְׁתְּשׁוּטִיטָה.

With regard to the moods and tenses of these three conjugations, there is but little to add to what has already been said regarding the simple *kátala*, *káttala*, and *kátala*. I will therefore merely make a remark upon the infinitives of the fifth and sixth conjugations in Arabic. As in the frequentative and iterative we found the form تَقَاتَل, for تَقَاتَل, though but little used, so we look here for a corresponding formation. This actually occurs in the rare تَقَاتَل, with assimilation of the preformative vowel. Examples تَحْكَمَال, تَكَلَام, تَمْلَق, تَنْقَام; to which we may add such concretes as تَلْقَام "glutton," تَلْقَاع "foolish chatterer," تَكْذَاب "mendacious," and the like. A great many Hebrew and Aramaic words with prefixed *t*, especially of the form תִּקְטֹל, belong by their signification to this conjugation, and not to the causative or factitive תִּקְטֹל. Such are in Syriac, ܬܝܬܢܝܬܐ, ܬܝܬܢܝܬܐ, ܬܝܬܢܝܬܐ, ܬܝܬܢܝܬܐ; in Hebrew, תְּחַנֵּן, תְּחַנֵּן, תְּחַנֵּן, תְּחַנֵּן, "entreaty, prayer," תְּפִלָּה "prayer," תְּעֻמָּה "secret," תְּעֻמָּה from תִּתְּנָה, תִּתְּנָה from תִּתְּנָה, etc. The Arabic however generally uses another form of the infinitive,

which is common to the 5th and 6th conjugations, viz. ^{5 3 3}تَقْتَل and ^{5 3 3}تَقَاتِل, with *u* in the 3rd syllable. These seem to be closely connected with such Hebrew and Aramaic forms as ^{5 3 3}שָׁלוּם, ^{5 3 3}שְׁלוּחִים, ^{5 3 3}שְׁבוּלִים, Bibl. Aram. אִשְׁתָּדוּר "rebellion," Mand. עֲתֻלְאֻשִׁיא, Talmud. אִמְנוּעִי, for אִתְּמֻנוּעִי, "withdraw from, abstain from." ^{5 3 3}תִּקְּל is almost exactly represented by the Hebrew concretes ^{5 3 3}תִּבְּלָל "having a white spot on the eye," ^{5 3 3}תֵּאֱשׂוּר "a kind of pine" or similar growing tree.

4. I pass on now to the last member of this group, the reflexive of the factitive or causative, which is represented by the 10th conjugation of the Arabic verb and the *Ettafal* of the Aramaic.

In Arabic the 10th conjugation is the reflexive or middle voice of the 4th; as ^{5 3 3}اِسْتَسَلَمَ "to give oneself up," ^{5 3 3}اِسْتَقَامَ "to hold oneself upright, stand upright," ^{5 3 3}اِسْتَخْلَفَ "select one as a deputy for oneself," ^{5 3 3}اِسْتَغْفَرَ "ask pardon for oneself," ^{5 3 3}اِسْتَحَالَ "deem something lawful" (for oneself to do). It is exceedingly common, and is derived, as I explained to you before, from the form *saḡtala*, by the prefixing of the syllable *ta*. This form *tasaghtala* became *itsaghtala*, and then, by the same transposition as is usual in Hebrew and Aramaic, *istaghtala*. Hence its identity with the Aramaic ^{5 3 3}אִשְׁתַּקְטַל from ^{5 3 3}שָׁקַטַל. It is found in Hīmyaritic or S. Arabian, without a prosthetic letter, *satafal* from *saḡal*, as ^{5 3 3}סַתּוּפִי, ^{5 3 3}סַתְּמַלֵּא. It also occurs in Assyrian; as ^{5 3 3}uštīšīb-šīnāt, "I have set them" or "made them dwell," for ^{5 3 3}uštīšīb [or ^{5 3 3}uštīšīb], from ^{5 3 3}אִשְׁבַּ אִשְׁבַּ; ^{5 3 3}altabušu, "I did," for ^{5 3 3}astabušu, from ^{5 3 3}עֲבַשׁ (Haupt *epēšu*). In Ethiopic we had, you may remember, three forms of the causative, 'aḡtāla, 'aḡattāla, and 'aḡatāla; and so also we have three forms of the reflexive, 'astagatāla or 'astagtāla, 'astagattāla and 'astagātāla; e.g. ለስተፈረሰ:

“to draw breath, be refreshed,” $\lambda\eta\tau\text{-}\eta\phi\text{-}\theta$: “to entreat,” $\lambda\eta\tau\text{-}\lambda\eta\rho$: “to ill-treat”: $\lambda\eta\tau\text{-}\theta\gamma\omega$: “be patient,” $\lambda\eta\tau\text{-}\alpha\omega\eta$: “rejoice”; $\lambda\eta\tau\text{-}\eta\alpha\lambda$: “compare with one another,” $\lambda\eta\tau\text{-}\eta\lambda$: “collect.” On its inflexion it is unnecessary to make any remarks, as it runs parallel to that of *ik̄tatala*. The other causative form اقتل *ak̄tala* forms in the Aramaic dialects a reflexive and passive by prefixing the syllable *eth*, as in the Palmyrene tariff מתאעלין , מתאעלן , from על , על . In Samaritan, Syriac and Mandaitic the assimilation of the *t* with the following *alif* takes place, e.g. אתשקע (אתשקע , “be found”), אתסנם (“be finished”), עש (עש), עלעל (עלעל), עלעל (עלעל), עלעל (עלעל).

C. Third Group.

Of the next group of derived conjugations the characteristic syllable is *na*.

I. The most prominent member of this group is a reflexive and passive of the simple form of the verb, in its original shape *na-katala*.

In Arabic this *nak̄atala* became first *naḥ̄atala*, and then, with prosthetic vowel, *inḥ̄atala*, انقتل ; as انشق “to split itself, open” (of a flower); انجزم “to let oneself be put to flight, to flee”; انقاد “to let oneself be led, to be docile or submissive”; انكسر “to be broken”; انقطع “to be cut off, to come to an end.” In Hebrew the imperfect and imperative and two infinitives follow the same mode of formation as in Arabic. The Arabic imperfect is ينقتل ; the Hebrew, יִקְטֹל for יִנְקֹטֹל , with constant assimilation of the preformative to the 1st radical. The Arabic imperative

is ⁵اَنقَتَلَ, the Hebrew ⁵הִקְטִיל, with the usual substitution of ה for א in these preformative syllables. The Arabic infinitive is ⁵اَنقَتَلَ; the corresponding Hebrew form is ⁵הִקְטִיל (with *ō* for *ā*), as ⁵הִנָּחַל, ⁵הִאָּכַל, beside which we have another form for the construct infinitive, viz. ⁵הִקְטִיל, as ⁵הִלָּחַם, ⁵הִפָּתַח, ⁵הִעָּזָר. But in the formation of the perfect, the participle, and one form of the infinitive absolute, the Hebrew has taken a different line. In the perfect the Hebrew contracted the primitive *naḳatāl* into *naḳtāl*, which was gradually weakened into *niḳtāl*. The original vowel of the 1st syllable is established by such words as ⁵נִחְבָּאת, ⁵נִעְשָׂה, ⁵נִלָּד, (for ⁵נִנָּלַד) ⁵נָסַב, (for ⁵נִנְסָבַב) ⁵נָסַג, (for ⁵nāsāg, from ⁵נִסָּג); whilst ⁵נִחְבָּאתָ, ⁵נִעְשָׂתָה, exhibit an intermediate state. The infinitive absolute is now ⁵נִקְטֹל, for *naḳtāl*, as ⁵נִעְתּוֹר, [where the original vowel of the first syllable is protected by the guttural following], ⁵נִקְרָא, ⁵נִלָּחַם. The Arabic participle, formed after the analogy of the imperfect, with prefixed *m*, is ⁵مُنْقَتِلٌ. The Hebrew, on the contrary, has no prefix, but exhibits the same form as the perfect, with a slight difference in the vowel of the 2nd syllable. As ⁵הִכָּם is differentiated from ⁵הִכָּם, so is ⁵נִאָּכַל, ⁵נִאָּכַל, from ⁵נִאָּכַל, ⁵נִאָּכַל; e.g. ⁵נִעְרָץ, ⁵נִבְהָל, ⁵נִוָּלַד, ⁵נִאָּזַר, ⁵נִחָתָם. We shall have occasion to notice a similar participial formation hereafter in the form *kuṭṭāl*, as ⁵אָכַל "eaten," ⁵יָוָלַד "born," ⁵לָקַח "taken." In a very few instances we seem to find an imperative after the form *niḳtāl* or *niḳtēl*, viz. ⁵נִקְבְּצוּ, in pause ⁵נִקְבְּצוּ, Is. xliii. 9; Joel iv. 11: ⁵נָלוּ Jerem. l. 5. The Hebrew form of the Niph'al seems to extend to Phoenician and Assyrian. In Phoenician we find ⁵נתן as the perf. Niph'al of ⁵יתן "to give," which we pronounce either ⁵נָתַן or ⁵נָתַן, and also ⁵נענש [ש], probably ⁵נעִנֵּשׁ.

In Assyrian Schrader gives such examples as *innabit* (נבת), "he fled," *innamir* (נמר), "was seen," *iššakin*, "was set up" or "restored," *iššibir*, "was broken," *ibbanū*, "were created." The imperative of *iššakin* is given as *naškin*, and the participle *muššakin*; the one resembling the rare Hebrew form נִקְבֵּץ (mentioned above), and the other the common Arabic form مَنَقَّلَ.

In Hımyaritic Halévy gives as an example the word הנהפש, with initial *h*.

2. Of the actual Niph'al of the Arabic and Hebrew there is no trace in Ethiopic, but a cognate form is preserved in the prefix *an*, which we find in quadrilaterals, more especially reduplicated verbs of the form *kalkala*, the Hebrew *Pilpēl*. The meaning of this formation in Ethiopic is not however so fixed as in Arabic and Hebrew. It generally implies motion, sometimes reflexive and reciprocal action; but sometimes too it is transitive, and admits of a passive being formed from it. Examples: ለንሰሰዐ: "to walk about," ለንፈረዐ: "to leap, dance," ለንጉድጉድ: "to thunder": ለንገለገ: "to come together, assemble"; ለንቀዕዐ: properly "to lean forward, prostrate oneself," but generally used in the sense of "lift up the eyes *or* heart in prayer"; ለንሎርሎ: "roll" (intrans. or trans.); ለንቀልቀል: "totter" and "shake"; ለንጠልዐ: "to spread out" as a veil, which is only transitive. Dillmann explains this curious phenomenon on the supposition that the nominal forms with initial *na*, like ነጉድጊድ: "thunder," ነሎርጊር: "rolling, a whirlwind," ነቀልቀል: "shaking," gave rise to the notion that the prefixed ለ might be identical with the causative or factitive prefix ለ. Hence, according to him, the occasional change of meaning, and the formation in a few cases of a passive with ተ, e.g. ተንሎርሎ: "to be rolled," ተንጠልዐ: "to be spread out." This view may perhaps be correct; I am not in a position to affirm or deny it. It may however be well to inform you that the Assyrian grammarians speak of forms like *iftana'al* and *istanaf'al* [Del. *iftanca'al* and *ittanaf'al*], in which an *n* is inserted, and yet the meaning of all the examples cited by Schrader is said to be transitive¹.

¹ [Those cited by Delitzsch, p. 233, are mostly intransitive or reflexive.]

3. Another member of this group is the Hebrew *Nithpa*“el, chiefly post-biblical. The Biblical examples are נִפְּרָר Deut. xxi. 8, for נִתְּפַר, “be atoned for, forgiven,” and נִסְּרָר Ezek. xxiii. 48, for נִתְּסַר, “let themselves be warned.” In post-biblical Hebrew it is common, and has usurped the place of the perfect Hithpa“el, as נִשְׁתַּמֵּשׁ, נִשְׁתַּבֵּל, נִזְדַּמֵּן, נִשְׁמָא; and is then extended to other formations, as נִשְׁתַּעַבַּד, נִתְּרַגַּם, נִתְּאֻלְמַנָּה “she is become a widow.”

4. Lastly we may reckon here the third conjugation of the quadriliteral verb in Arabic, where the letter *n* is inserted after the 2nd radical; as اِبْرَشَق “to open” (of a flower), “to bloom”; اِحْرَاجَم “to be gathered together in a mass or crowd”; اِسْتَقَى “to lie on one’s back”; اِثْعَاجَر “to flow.”

D. Fourth Group.

I will next speak briefly of a group of *reduplicated* forms. This reduplication is of different kinds, but always takes place at the end of the root, not at the beginning. The chief varieties are, to use the Hebrew terms, *Pi’lél*, *Pš’al’al*, and *Pilpél*.

1. Starting from the root *ḵatala*, the simplest form of such a reduplication is the repetition of the 3rd radical, *ḵatalala*. But *ḵatalala* would naturally become *ḵatlāl*, which would be weakened in Aramaic into *ḵatlēl*, and in Hebrew into *ḵithlél*. Aramaic examples are not numerous; e.g. עֲרַבֵּב “mix up, confuse”; חֲבַב “crumble,” חָבַב “separate,” חָבַב “practise, reduce to slavery,” with its passive חֻבַּב; חָבַב “irritate,” and חֻבַּב “to become fierce”; חֻבַּב “to be intelligent, sensible.” In Hebrew this form has taken the place of *Pi’el* in verbs עָוָה, as נִוָּר (better from נִוָּר than from נִוָּר), עוֹרָר, בּוֹנֵן, etc., and

forms a reflexive and passive with prefixed *ta*, תִּתְפַּעֵל. In other classes of verbs it is rare, but we can refer to it שָׁאֵן “to be quiet, still,” Jerem. xxx. 10; Job iii. 18; רָעַן in the fem. רָעֲנָה Job xv. 33; further, with passive pronunciation, אָמַל “to be withered, wither away, mourn”; and from verbs לָה, נָאָה, contracted נָאָה “to be seemly, beautiful”; מִטְחוּי־קִשֵּׁת, from טָהַר “to shoot,” and the reflexive הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה, from שָׁחָה. As to the Arabic development of the original *katalala*, it generally took the following course; *katalala* became *ḳ̣atalala*, *iḳ̣talala*, and finally *iḳ̣talla*. This form *iḳ̣talla* appears in the Arabic paradigm as the 9th conj. of the verb, with the cognate *iḳ̣talla* as the 11th; e.g. اَرْوَرَّ and اَرْوَرَّ “turn away,” اَرَبَّتَّ and اَرَبَّتَّ “be scattered,” اَرَقَّدَّ “run quickly,” اِشْعَانَّ “be dishevelled”; and constantly of colours and defects, as اِعْوَجَّ, اِعْوَجَّ, “be crooked”; اِحْوَلَّ, اِحْوَلَّ, “squint”; اِصْفَرَّ, اِصْفَرَّ, “be yellow”; اَبْيَضَّ, اَبْيَضَّ, “be white.” The uncontracted form *iḳ̣talala* survives only in some examples from verbs 3rd rad. و or ي; as اَرْعَوِي “to abstain, refrain”; اِحْوَوِي “to become brownish,” with its byform اِحْوَاوِي “to stand on tiptoe.” A kind of reflexive or passive, with *n* inserted after the 2nd rad., may perhaps be discerned in the rare 14th conj. of the Arabic verb, اِقْتَنَلَّ for قَتَنَلَّ; as اِحْلَنَكَ “be jet black” (حَلَكَ), اِعْلَنَكَ “be long and thick” (of the hair), اِقْعَنَسَسَ “have a hump in front” (قَعَسَ).

2. A stronger form of the reduplication consists in the repetition of two radicals, the 2nd and 3rd. Hence the form

I find a few similar forms in Syriac from verbs final ܐ and ܬ ; e.g. ܐܠܝܫܐܒ "to boast or brag"; ܐܠܝܢܗܒ "to lie down, be hidden, be blamed"; ܐܠܝܚܒ "become young, be smeared over." In Hebrew it can hardly be said to exist, unless we take count of הַצֹּזֵר "to blow the trumpet" (מַהֲצִיזִים), from הַצִּזְרָה . But the form is doubtful, the $kəz̄$ being מַהֲצִיזִים ; and even if we assume it to be correct, הַצֹּזֵר might stand for הַצִּזְרָה , as עֲצֵרוֹ in Is. xv. 5, if correct, stands for יַעֲרֵרוֹ .

5. The reduplication of the form *ḵatalala* or *ḵatlala* seems in some cases to have been softened into *ḵatalaya*, which would be represented in Arabic by كَتَلَّى كَتَلَّى , and in Aramaic by ܟܬܠܝ . Such words are in Mandaitic ܢܐܬܝܒܝܐ "to bewail," ܢܐܬܝܒܝܐ "to make an alien, estrange"; in Syr. ܬܠܝܒ "terrify," ܬܠܝܒ "es-
trange," ܬܠܝܒ "be deprived of, fail, perish," ܬܠܝܒ "expose," ܬܠܝܒ "deport," with their passives. In Arabic a passive of this form is found in the 15th conj. of the verb, اِنْعَلَى , with n inserted after the 2nd rad.; as اِحْبَنْطَى "to be swollen or inflated" (حَبَطَ), اِعْلَنْدَى "be stout and strong" (عَلَدَ "be hard"). Curiously enough, a few verbs of this form in Arabic have a transitive sense, e.g. اِسْرَنْدَى "to overcome" (سَرَنْدَى "strong, brave"), اِغْرَنْدَى "to assail, overcome"; and, still more strangely, the only Mandaitic parallel, ܥܘܪܐܡܒܝܐ , "to be shaken," is derived from an active ܘܪܐܡܒܝܐ , which however does not occur in the extant literature.

E. *The Passive Forms.*

Lastly, in this enumeration of the verbal forms or conjugations, I would call your attention to the real passives, as distinguished from the reflexives and effectives, which so often discharge the functions of passives.

In Arabic nearly all the conjugations are capable of forming, and actually form, passives by means of internal modification of the vowels of the active voice. There are of course exceptions, which will readily suggest themselves to you. For instance, a verb like صَلَّحَ "to be good *or* right," فَرِحَ "to be glad," or ثَقَلَ "to be heavy," cannot have a passive; nor one like اِسْوَدَّ, "to be black." The vowel-change in the passive voice consists, generally speaking, in the substitution of duller sounds for the clearer ones of the active, the vowel *u* almost always playing a prominent part.

In the other Semitic languages the use of these real passives is far less frequent. In Hebrew the largest survival is found; much less in Aramaic. In Ethiopic they have, to all appearance, utterly vanished. In Assyrian Sayce states that "a passive formed by means of the obscure vowel *u*" exists for Pa'ēl, Shaph'ēl, Aph'ēl, and Istaph'al; but I do not find that he is supported by Schrader or Oppert. From my own knowledge I cannot speak¹.

1. In Arabic the following are the principal passives:

Perfect.		Imperfect.	
(1) <i>ḵatala</i>	<i>ḵutīla</i>	<i>yaktulu</i>	<i>yukṭalu</i>
(2) <i>ḵattala</i>	<i>ḵuttīla</i>	<i>yukattilu</i>	<i>yukattalu</i>
(3) <i>ḵātala</i>	<i>ḵūtīla</i>	<i>yukātīlu</i>	<i>yukātalu</i>
(4) <i>'aktala</i>	<i>'ukṭīla</i>	<i>yukṭilu</i>	<i>yukṭalu</i>
(5) <i>taḵattala</i>	<i>tukuttīla</i>	<i>yataḵattalu</i>	<i>yutakattalu</i>
(6) <i>taḵātala</i>	<i>tukūtīla</i>	<i>yataḵātalu</i>	<i>yutakātalu</i>
[(7) <i>inḵatala</i>	<i>unḵutīla</i>	<i>yankatīlu</i>	<i>yunkatalu</i>]
(8) <i>iktatala</i>	<i>ukṭutīla</i>	<i>yaktatīlu</i>	<i>yukṭatalu</i>
(10) <i>istaḵtala</i>	<i>ustukṭīla</i>	<i>yastakṭīlu</i>	<i>yustakṭalu</i>

¹ [According to Delitzsch, p. 249, the permansives II. 1 and III. 1 (Pa'ēl and Shaph'ēl) may be used either in active or passive sense, but without difference of form.]

2. In Hebrew the formation is similar, but not identical, the vowel *a* predominating throughout in the second syllable. The passives in use are:—

(a) Intensive and iterative, *kuttal*, *kottal*, imperf. *yčkuttal*. The infin. absolute has the form קטל, as גנב, Gen. xl. 15. The participle appears in two shapes, the one with prefixed *m*, *mečkuttal*; the other without it, as אכל, יולד, לקח, הלל, Ezek. xxvi. 17. And here it is curious to remark in what different ways the several Semitic languages have made use of the materials at their disposal. The Hebrew infinitive קטל stands for *kuttal*; but the corresponding form in Aramaic is a verbal noun from the active Pa'el, e.g. גִּבְסָא "theft," וְסוֹסִין "warning," מְסַמָּא "finishing": whilst the Arabic *kuttal* is now the plural of the active participle of the simple verb *katala*, as *kâtil*^m, a "murderer," *kuttal*^m, "murderers." So again, the Hebrew participle אכל stands for *'ukkāl*, a sing. masc.; whereas the corresponding form in Arabic is another plural of the active participle of the simple *katala*, as *sâg'id*, "worshipper," *sug'gud*, "worshippers."

(b) The form expressive of effort, *kôtal*, imperf. *yčkôtal*, as יִשְׁרָשׁוּ, Job xxxi. 8.

(c) The causative or factitive, *hoktal*, *huktal*, imperf. *yoktal*.

Other forms are comparatively rare, but I may mention:—

(d) *Hothkatal*, in the form הִתְפַּקְרוּ, Num. i. 47, ii. 33, xxvi. 62; 1 Kings xx. 27; instead of הִתְפַּקְרוּ.

(e) *Hothkattal*, in הִטְפַּמָּה, Deut. xxiv. 4; הִדְשָׁנָה, for הִדְשָׁנָה, Is. xxxiv. 6; הִפְבֵּס infinitive, Levit. xiii. 55, 56.

In these two cases, if correctly pointed, observe that the Hebrew changes only the vowel of the preformative syllable: whereas in Arabic it is the vowel of the first radical syllable that is modified, and that of the preformative is assimilated to it. Compare أَتَقَدَّرُ with هَتَفَكَّرُو, or تَتَبَّعْتُ with هَدَشَّنَا.

(f) A curious form is presented to us in the Hebrew נָגַאלוּ, Is. lix. 3; Lament. iv. 14. This is generally explained as a passive of Niph'al, נִגְאָלָה, Zeph. iii. 1. I should rather be inclined to regard it as a quasi-Niph'al formation from the Pi'el גָּאַל, Pu'al גָּאַל. If you adopt the former view, you must regard נָגַאלוּ as = אִנְעִלוּ; if the latter, I can produce a parallel from the vulgar Arabic of Egypt, viz. اِنْصَح "it is lost, forfeited" (Spitta, *Contes Arabes*, p. 9, l. 10), from صَح "to lose, forfeit." Here again perhaps the Massoretic punctuation may be erroneous (נִגְאָלוּ).

(g) *Kutlal*, in אִמְלָל.

(h) *Kolkal*, in כָּלְכָלוּ, 1 Kings xx. 27, and תִּשְׁעֲשְׁעוּ, Is. lxvi. 12.

3. Of the Aramaic passive the chief traces are the following.

(a) The passive of *Pʿal*, in a form which appears at first to be that of the passive participle *Pʿil*, and is accordingly generally so treated, even by Kautzsch. In my opinion, however, the verbal flexion of this form forbids us to regard it as a participle, and Noeldeke is right in adopting the other view. The form was originally *kutlil*, but the weight of the accent produced a lengthening of the vowel of the 2nd syllable, whilst that of the 1st syllable was weakened in the regular verb to simple shēvā: טָרִיד Dan. iv. 30, יְהִיב Dan. vii. 4, 6, כְּתִיב Ezra v. 7, קָטִיל Dan. v. 30, רָשִׁים Dan. v. 24, נָשָׁלם Ezra v. 16; 3rd fem. בְּטִלָּתַי Ezra iv. 24, יְהִיבַת Dan. vii. 27, נְטִילָתַי Dan. vii. 4, פְּרִיסַת Dan. v. 28, קָטִילַת Dan. vii. 11; 2nd sing. masc. תְּקַלְתָּא Dan. v. 27; 3rd plur. masc. יְהִיבוּ Ezra v. 15, כְּפָתוּ Dan. iii. 21, מְרִיטוּ Dan. vii. 4, פְּתִיחוּ Dan. vii. 10. The distinction of form is clearer in the case of verbs לִא, where the

perfect passive is גָּלִי Dan. ii. 19, גָּלִי Dan. ii. 30, קָרִי Ezra iv. 18, 23; plur. רָמִיּוּ Dan. iii. 21, vii. 9; whereas the form of the participle Pē'il is בָּנָה, מָנָה, קָרִי, שָׂרָה, plur. שָׂרִין. Similarly in the Palmyrene tariff, גָּבִי = Arab. جَبِي; see Sachau in *ZDMG.* xxxvii. pp. 564—5.

(b) The passive of *Hiph'āl*, viz. *Hoph'al*, in Biblical Aramaic and the Palmyrene dialect, viz. הִנָּחַת Dan. v. 20, הוֹבֵר Dan. vii. 11, הָפֵק Dan. vi. 24, הָעֵל Dan. v. 13, plur. הָעֵלוּ Dan. v. 15; fem. sing. הִחְרַבְתָּ Ezra iv. 15, הוֹסַפְתָּ לִּי Dan. iv. 33, הִקִּימְתָּ Dan. vii. 4 (cf. أَقِيمَتْ); 1st pers. הִתְקַנַּת (not נָתַת) Dan. iv. 33. Very peculiar are the forms הִיתִית Dan. vi. 18, and הִיתִיּוּ Dan. iii. 13, the vocalisation of the 1st syllable of which is as yet unexplained. Similarly in the Palmyrene tariff, אָשֵׁר (from שָׂרָה), e.g. ויכתב אשור לאגורא; imperfect יִכְתֵּב, e.g. ויכתב מדעם די לא מִפֶּק, e.g. למדעם מרעמא מכסה די מן עידא ויהוא מבטל לארכוניא די הֶן בוכן, e.g. מבטל: מסק בנמיסא מדי יהוא מ[תאעל] בר מן תחומא או מִפֶּק, e.g. מאפֶּק, for מִפֶּק, e.g. מדי יהוא מ[תאעל] בר מן תחומא או מאפֶּק.

(c) The passive of *Pi'āl*, viz. *Pu'al*, in the Palmyrene tariff, [ומן כל] משך די יתאעל או יובן למשכא אפֶדֶן, e.g. יובן.

(d) The passive participles of *Pa'āl*, *Aph'āl* and *Shaph'āl*, formed exactly as in Arabic. Thus in Biblical Aramaic מְהַלֵּךְ, מְכַלֵּל, but מְכַפֵּתִין “bound,” Dan. iii. 23, 24, from מְכַפֵּת; מְסֻפֵּל “hidden things,” Dan. ii. 22, from מְסַתֵּר; מְהַחֲצֵפָה Dan. v. 19, and מְהַנּוֹקֵת מְלָכִין Ezra iv. 15, but מְהַחֲצֵפָה Dan. ii. 15, or מְחַצֵּף, מְחַצֵּף, from מְחַצֵּף. Also from *Pō'al*, מְסוּבֵּלִין “set up, erected,” Ezra vi. 3, from מְסוּבֵּל.

Exactly so in Syriac, ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}, ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}; ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}, ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}; ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}, ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}; and in Mandaitic, ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} “blessing,” ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} “blessed”; ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} “covering,” ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} “covered”; ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} “teaching,” ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} “taught,” ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} “bringing out,” ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} “brought out.” The corresponding Arabic forms are ^{مَلَّيْتُ}, ^{مَلَّيْتُ}, ^{مَلَّيْتُ}, ^{مَلَّيْتُ}.

(e) The existence of passive participles of Pa“ēl and Aph“ēl after the *Hebrew* formation is not certain in Mandaitic, but Noeldeke gives for the Pa“ēl the possible instances of ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}, “the highlands,” for ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}, and ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}, a name of Paradise, lit. “the taken away of righteousness,” i.e. “the land of righteousness that has been taken away,” = ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}. On the other hand, the existence of Pu“al and Hoph“al participles in modern Syriac seems tolerably certain. For example, in Pu“al, ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} “I have healed thee,” is literally ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} “thou hast been healed by me,” the fem. being ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}, for ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}. So also in Pu“al, ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}, *zubbinnē*, for ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}, for ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ}: in Hoph“al, ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} “raised up,” ^{ܡܠܝܬܐ} “exalted”; with weakening of the vowel in the 2nd syllable.

CHAPTER IX.

THE IRREGULAR VERBS.

I NOW proceed, with the Hebrew Grammar in hand, to explain to you the principal forms of the Irregular Verbs, comparing them, as before, with the corresponding forms in Arabic and Syriac, and more rarely in other dialects.

I. Verbs *y'y* or *Geminate Verbs*.

I begin with the verbs *y'y*, or, as they are called in Arabic Grammars, the *doubled* or *geminate verbs* or the *solid verbs*. The peculiarity here is the contraction of the trisyllabic root into a disyllable by the rejection of the vowel of the second radical or some other modification.

In classical Arabic the rules of contraction are few and simple.

(a) If all three radicals have vowels, the 2nd radical loses its vowel, and unites with the 3rd, so as to form a double letter.

Hence سَبَبَ, "to cause," becomes سَبَّ; مَسَسَ "to touch,"

حَبَّ; حَبَّبَ "to become dear" (to one), حَبَّبَ. The original form may be retained in poetry, for the sake of the metre, as

ضَنُّوا for ضَنُّوا, "they are stingy"; and in some verbs of the

forms فَعَّلَ and فَعَّلَ the contraction does not take place, as مَكَكَ

"to be knock-kneed," لَحَّحَ "to be sore" (of the eyes), لَبَّبَ "to

be wise," دَمَمَ "to be ugly." Vulg. Arab., *madd*, 'add, *ẓann*.

(b) If the first radical has no vowel, and the 2nd and 3rd have, then the 2nd radical throws back its vowel on the 1st, and unites with the 3rd, so as to form a double letter. Hence ^{سبب}يسبب becomes ^{يسبب}يسبب; ^{يغفر}يغفر; ^{ييسس}ييسس; ^{ييسس}ييسس. The original forms may be used by poetic license, as ^{يحلل}يحلل for ^{يحل}يحل. Vulg. Arab., *yeḡunn*, *ye'idd*, *yiṣaḥḥ*.

(c) If the 3rd radical is vowelless, no contraction, generally speaking, takes place. The forms in ordinary use are ^{سببت}سببت, ^{حببت}حببت, ^{مسست}مسست.

(d) Forms that might by rule remain uncontracted are sometimes contracted in different ways. For example, the jussive of ^{سب}سب is ^{يسبب}يسبب, and the imperative ^{اسبب}اسبب; but both are usually contracted, with the help of a supplementary vowel, into ^{يسب}يسب and ^{اسب}اسب. Vulg. Arab., *ḡunn*, *'idd*.

Bearing these rules in mind, we may proceed to compare the Arabic forms with those of the Hebrew and Syriac, using chiefly as our paradigms ^{رد}رد, ^{סב}סב, and ^{בא}בא.

Kal. Here the uncontracted forms are relatively far more common in Hebrew than in Arabic, as ^{סבב}סבב, ^{סבר}סבר, ^{סבב}סבב, ^{סבב}סבב, fem. ^{נדרה}נדרה, plur. ^{נדרו}נדרו, ^{סבבו}סבבו, ^{סבבו}סבבו. The contracted 3rd sing. masc. ^{סב}סב and ^{בא}בא stand for *sabb* and *bass*, and these for *sabba* and *bassa*, *sababa* and *basasa*, like ^{רד}רד for ^{רדד}רדד. Add a suffix, and the doubling immediately becomes audible. ^{קבה}קבה, ^{הנני}הנני for *ḡabba-lu*; Aram. ^{בָּסַב}בָּסַב; like Arabic ^{رَدَدْنِي}رَدَدْنِي. In the same way in the 3rd pers. plur. ^{סבו}סבו, ^{תמו}תמו, J. Aram. ^{דקו}דקו, Syr. ^{ܕܡܝܬܝܢ}ܕܡܝܬܝܢ, for *sababū*, *tamamū*, *daḡaḡū*, as in Arabic ^{رَدَدُوا}رَدَدُوا for ^{رَدَدُوا}رَدَدُوا. The retention of the tone on the 1st syllable is in accordance with

the primitive accent, but it is often shifted to the last syllable, as **רָבוּ**, **זָבוּ**. The real existence of forms like **רָבוּ**, Gen. xlix. 23, and **רָמוּ**, Job xxiv. 24, is somewhat doubtful; but if genuine, they would find their analogy in the Arabic forms of praise and blame, **حَبَّ** for **حَبَّبَ**, **حَسَنَ** for **حَسَّنَ**, and **بَعَدَ** for **بَعَّدَ**. In the 3rd p. fem. sing., Syr. **ܠܐܝܬܐ** stands for *bazzath* (Bibl. Aram. **עֲלִיתָ**, Mand. **שׂאראת**, **פאסאת**), *bazasat*: and similarly **ܠܐܝܬܐ** for *sabbath*, *sababat*, as **ܠܐܝܬܐ** for **ܠܐܝܬܐ**. The primitive accent is often retained, as in **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, but may be shifted, as in **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, Is. vi. 12. In the 1st and 2nd persons, the normal form is the uncontracted Arabic **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, which we find in Hebrew only in the forms **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, Zech. viii. 14, 15; **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, Deut. ii. 35. But these forms may be altered in two ways even in Arabic. Firstly, the 2nd radical may be dropped, and its vowel go with it, or it may be transferred to the 1st radical; as **ܠܐܝܬܐ** for **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, **ܠܐܝܬܐ** or **ܠܐܝܬܐ** for **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, **ܠܐܝܬܐ** for **ܠܐܝܬܐ**. So in Aramaic **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, **ܠܐܝܬܐ** for *bazasta*, *bazastôn*, *bazaznan*. So in Hebrew, **ܠܐܝܬܐ** for *tamamnû*, Num. xvii. 28. The 1st pers. sing., however, in Aramaic, is **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, Mand. **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, Syr. **ܠܐܝܬܐ** for *basseth*, *bassit*, *bazasti*. Secondly, the 3rd radical may coalesce in the usual way with the second, and to make the doubling audible a vowel-sound may be inserted after it. This vowel-sound seems to have been that of the diphthong *au* or *ai*, which was favoured by the corresponding forms of the verbs 3rd **ܠܐܝܬܐ** and **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, as **ܠܐܝܬܐ**, **ܠܐܝܬܐ**. More probably however it was *ai*, which is far more frequent in the language than *au*, occurring alone for instance in all the

derived conjugations. Hence ^{רָדַדְתָּ} would become (through the impossible *raddta*) *raddaita*, and this is the ordinary form at the present day, *raddait*, *raddît*, and in Algiers *raddît*. We have seen, however, that the diphthong *ai* passed in some cases into *a*; for instance, Arab. ^{أَيْنَ}, Heb. ^{אֵין}, ^{אֵנָה}; ^{בָּתִּים}, from ^{בֵּית}, ^{דְּבָרִים}, from ^{דְּבַר}; ^{דְּבָרָיו} or ^{דְּבָרוֹ}, from ^{דְּבַר}; and in Arabic itself ^{دَوَابَّة} for ^{دَوَابَّة}, dimin. of ^{دَابَّة}. Hence out of ^{رَدִית} sprang the form ^{رَدَات}, the dialectical existence of which is vouched for by the grammarians; and hence the Hebrew ^{סַבְּתִי}, ^{הַגֶּתֶם}, ^{וַמֹּות}, for *sabbâti*, *sababî*. Of course the Hebrew *ô* in these forms might be as readily derived from an original *au*, but we have no evidence of the existence of a form *raddauta*, whereas *raddâta* is a known dialectical variety of *raddaita*.

The infinitive construct in Hebrew exhibits two forms: uncontracted, ^{לְהַנְנֶכֶם}, far more rarely with *a*, ^{לְהַנְנֶב}, Is. xxx. 18, ^{לְהַנְנָה}, Ps. cii. 14; and contracted, ^{לְהַנְנֶה}, far more rarely with *a*, ^{לְהַנְנֶה}, Is. xlv. 1, ^{לְהַנְנֶה}, Jerem. v. 26. These are, of course, nothing but segolates of the same form as the Arabic ^{رَدَّ}, ^{رَدَّ}.

The Arabic imperative presents to us, as I explained above, the forms ^{رَدِّ}, ^{رَدِّ}, ^{رَدِّ}. These are exactly equivalent to the Hebrew ^{רַדְּ}, ^{רַדְּ}, perhaps also ^{רַדְּ}, Ps. cxix. 22; in Aramaic, ^{רַדְּ}, Mand. ^{רַדְּ} “wash,” ^{רַדְּ} “dwell”; Syr. ^{رَدِّ}, ^{رَدِّ} (from ^{رَدِّ}). An example of the uncontracted form is ^{רַדְּ}, Jerem. xlix. 28, corresponding to an Arabic ^{رَدِّ} for ^{رَدِّ}.

The Arabic imperfect has, as I explained to you, the forms

يَمْسُ . يَفْرُ . يَرِدُ. The first of these is reproduced exactly in the Hebrew יָסַב for *yasubb*, *yasubbu*, *yasubbu*, with suffix יִסְבְּנִי, plural. יִסְבּוּ for *yasubbu*, *yasubbūna*. This *ō* has rarely been weakened into *ā*, but we find examples in יָרִין Is. xlii. 4, יָרִין Prov. xxix. 6, יָיִסַד Ps. xci. 6. These may not improbably have been influenced by the imperfect of verbs ע"ו, as in Mand., where נִימֹךְ (from מָאךְ) is identical with נִיקֹם from קָאם, and conversely נִדְאָר "dwells," נִגְאָר "commits adultery," cannot be distinguished from נִהָאם "be hot," תִּירָאג "desirest." In intransitives like the Arabic يَمْسُ . يَفْرُ, where the characteristic vowel of the imperfect is *a*, the Hebrew no longer maintains the ancient *yakṭal*, but employs the more recent *yikṭal*. Thus the imperfect of כָּר is not יִמַר but יִמַר, for *yimrar*, *yamrar*. So יִרַע, and a few more. In 1 Kings i. 1 the form is pointed יַחַם instead of יָחַם. The reason of this deviation from the form with *a* in the first syllable probably was that יִמַר, יִרַע, too closely resembled in their vocalisation that of the *perfect*. Indeed יִמַר, יִרַע, and יִרַר, rightly appear as verbal roots in our lexicons. This has not however prevented the substitution of the form יִזְמוּ for יִזְמוּ in Gen. xi. 6, because the singular must actually have been יִזֵּם, not יִזֵּם. In the fem. plur. תִּצְלִינָה, תִּסְבִּינָה, the diphthong *ai* has again been inserted to facilitate the pronunciation of the contracted forms, which stand respectively for *tashubna* and *tašlilna*, the intermediate steps being *tasubbna*, *tašillna*, then *tasubbaina*, *tašillaina*.

The Aramaic dialects go their own way in the formation of the imperfect and infinitive. They throw back the lost doubling of the 2nd and 3rd radicals upon the 1st. Hence נִבְזָא, יִדְקָא, נִבְזָא, נִבְזָא, for *yidukḳ*, *nēbuz*, etc., from *yadukḳu*, *nabuzzu*; and in the infinitive, מִדְקָא, מִבְזָא, for *midḳaḳ*, *mēbzaz*. The

Hebrew also has this form in such words as יָקַד, יָדְמוּ, יָדַם; יָקְדוּ, יָתְמוּ, יָתַם; תַּצְלִיחַ, Jerem. xix. 3, for תַּצְלִיחַ; and so forth.

The participle active has in Hebrew the uncontracted form חָנַן, חָנֵן, חָנִין, whereas in Arabic the contraction is prevalent, حَاجٍ, حَاجٌّ, and the uncontracted حَالٍ occurs as a rare poetic license. In vulg. Arab. however the uncontracted حَاجِبٍ is common in the masc. sing., whereas in the fem. sing. and in the plur. masc. and fem. the contracted form is more usual. In Syriac the form has been influenced by that of verbs ע״ו. The sing. masc. is therefore חָנַן, חָנֵן, like חָסַח, but the fem. sing. and the plurals are regular, חָנַת, חָנַת, חָנַת, for *ḥāḥilāt, ḥāḥilīn, ḥāḥilān*¹. In Bibl. Aram. we find the uncontracted plur. עָלִיין, Dan. iv. 5, v. 8, as *Kēthibh*, the *Kēre* being עָלִין, as also in Samarit. עֲלִיל, עֲלִילָה.²

Let us now glance rapidly at the derived conjugations.

Niphal. Here the chief peculiarity in Hebrew is the pure vowel of the 1st syllable, נָסַב, נָהַר, נָקַל, for *nasabb, naharr, naḥall*, from *nasbab, nahrar, naḥlal*. Curiously enough, however, we find here the intransitive vowels of the *Kal* also used in the 2nd syllable; e.g. נָסַב, נָקַל, נָרִין; and so in the fem., נִשְׁמָה, but נִסְבָּה; and in the plur., נִשְׁמָנו, נִסְבָּנו, but also נִשְׁמָנו, נִנְּלוּ. This seems due to the resemblance of נָסַב to the ordinary *Kal* נָנַשׁ, whence the same variations that were admissible in the one came in course of time to be thought allowable in the other. Others think that the *ō* forms are due to the influence of verbs ע״ו. There is a fourth form, which altogether gives up the

¹ A possible instance of this Aramaic form in Hebrew is נִשְׁמָנו, Jerem. xxx. 16 (*Kēthibh*), if we derive it from נִשְׁמָנו = נִשְׁמָנו, the sing. being נִשְׁמָנו for נִשְׁמָנו.

² [עֲלִיל occurs also in Palmyrene; in Palestinian Syriac both עֲלִיל and חֲשִׁשׁ "suffering" are found: the former word makes its plural עֲלִיין.]

doubling and inflects exactly like the *Kal* of נָגַשׁ, for the same reason as the first three: e.g. נִגְּלוּ, נִבְּקָה, נִסְבַּה. A fifth form resembles the ordinary Niph'al in the vowel of the first syllable, as נָחַל, נָחַת, נָחַר, and gives the plur. נִחְלוּ, נִחְרוּ; particip. נִחְלִים, נִחְרִים. This seems to be a secondary formation from נִגַּשׁ, after the fashion of Niph'al נִגַּשׁ from *Kal* נָגַשׁ.—Of the 2nd person examples are very rare; but we find נִמְלָתָם side by side with נִמְלָתָם and נִחְלָתָם.—Similarly in the first person we have נִקְלָוֹתִי, with the plur. נִשְׁדָּנוּ, Micah ii. 4, where the supplementary vowel *ô* has been weakened into *ä*.—For the sake of comparison with the above I need only mention the Arabic forms *انجارت* for *ingarara*; 2nd pers. *انجرت*, uncontracted.—In the imperfect, the ordinary form is *يسب*, for *yissabb*, by assimilation and contraction for *yansabib*; as *يسب*, *يسب*, *يسب*. The uncontracted form occurs in *يلبب*, Job xi. 12. The corresponding plural naturally exhibits the double letter, *يسبون*, *يسبون*, contracted for *yansabibû(na)*, *yanmadidû(na)*. Such words as *يروع*, Prov. xi. 15, xiii. 20, and *يتروى*, Ezek. xxix. 7, follow the analogy of verbs *عوى*. In Arabic, for the sake of comparison, take *ينجرون* for *ينجرون*, plur. *ينجرون*.

Hiphil. In the perfect the Arabic form is أَجَرَّ for أَجَر, 2nd pers. أَجَرْت. Contractions like أَحَسْتُ and أَحْسَيْتُ, for أَحَسْتُ, are very rare in the classical language. The Hebrew follows the form *hiḳtal* or *hiḳtāl* instead of *haktāl*; e.g. הִיָּקַל, הִסֵּב, הִחַל, which stand for *hidaḳḳ*, *husebb*, etc., by contraction for *hidḳaḳ*, *hisbēb*. The uncontracted form in its latest stage appears in הִיָּלִל, הִרְנִין, which never undergo contraction (also in Syriac ܐܢܠܐ, Mand. ܐܢܠܐ), and in the participle

מִשְׁמִים, Ezek. iii. 15. The fem. sing. and plur. actually exhibit the doubling הִחֲלָה, הִחֲלוּ, הִקְלָו, הִתְמוּ, הִרְעוּ, הִפְרוּ. The 2nd pers. usually has the form הִרְעָתָם (הִחֲלוֹתָ). The original 1st pers. *haktalti* occurs in all its purity in הִחֲתַמְתִּי, Jerem. xlix. 37; and a modification of the 2nd pers. in הִתְחַלֵּתָ and הִפְחַרְתָּ, for *hithlalta* and *hiphrarta*.—In the imperfect the Arabic form is يَجْرُ for يَجْرُب. The Hebrew preserves a purer vowel in the 1st syllable, יִסֵּב for *yāsēbb*, contracted from *yasbēb* for *yasbibu*, יִגַּן, יִפֹּר; plur. יַחֲלוּ for *yaḥlilū(na)*.

In the Aramaic dialects the doubling is thrown back upon the 1st radical, as in the imperfect Pē'al, whence arise the forms הִדַּק, הִנָּעַל or הִנָּעַל, הִנָּעַל, for הִדַּקַּק, הִנָּעַק, impf. נָבֹ, יִדַּק. To these correspond such Hebrew imperfects as יַחֲלֵ, יַתֵּם, יִסֵּב. The plural however has two formations, one of which retains the doubling of the 2nd radical, whilst the other is purely Aramaic in dropping it. The former is exemplified by וַיִּפְּנוּ, the latter by וַיִּבְתּוּ, Deut. i. 44.

The passive is in Arabic أُجِرَّ for أُجِرَّ, 2nd pers. أُجِرَّت, impf. يُجَرُّ for يُجَرِّ. The Hebrew form הוֹסֵב stands for *hus-bab*, but has been influenced by the corresponding form of verbs הוֹקֵם, עוֹ; e.g. הוֹחֵל, הוֹתֵל, fem. הוֹחֵדָה. In the imperfect we find a treble formation, as in the Hiph'il, there being forms (1) like יוֹדַק, in pause for יִדַּק, resembling יִסֵּב; (2) like יִפְתָּ, plur. יִפְתּוּ, resembling יִסֵּב, plur. יִפְּנוּ; and (3) like הִמְכּוּ, Job xxiv. 24; יִהְקוּ, in pause for יִהֲקוּ, Job xix. 23, resembling the Aramaic הִדַּק and יִדַּקוּן.

II. A. Verbs of which the 1st radical is w or y.

Of these the former, פִּ", are by far the more common in the

Semitic languages. The number of verbs first *y* in Arabic and Ethiopic is very small indeed; in Hebrew and Syriac it appears to be larger, but this phenomenon is due to a peculiar change which verbs first *w* undergo in these two languages.

I. The normal form of verbs first *w* in the perfect of the first or simple form is that of the Arabic, ^{وَدَعَ}وَدَعَ, ^{وَعَدَ}وَعَدَ, ^{وَعِظَ}وَعِظَ, ^{وَدَّعَ}وَدَّعَ. Similarly in Ethiopic, ^{ወለደ}ወለደ: ^{ወረሐ}ወረሐ: ^{ወረደ}ወረደ: ^{ወፀሎ}ወፀሎ: ^{ወዕዞ}ወዕዞ. The only example that I remember in Ethiopic of the change of *w* into *y* is in ^{ላደደዐ}ላደደዐ: "to make known," the causative of an unused ^{ደደዐ}ደደዐ: Heb. ^{יָדַע}יָדַע. The corresponding Arabic verb is ^{وَدَعَ}وَدَعَ "to put, place, store up, deposit"; what we "know" is that which we have "placed" or "stored up" in the mind for use¹. In Hebrew the initial *w* almost invariably passes into *y*, unless protected by a preceding consonant; hence ^{יָדַע}יָדַע, ^{יָעַן}יָעַן, ^{יָעַד}יָעַד, ^{יָלַד}יָלַד, ^{יָצָא}יָצָא, ^{יָרַד}יָרַד, ^{יָרַשׁ}יָרַשׁ, ^{יָגַע}יָגַע, ^{יָגַר}יָגַר. The same remark applies to the Aramaic: e.g. in Biblical Aramaic, ^{יָדַע}יָדַע, ^{יָהַב}יָהַב, further ^{יָקַר}יָקַר, ^{יָלַד}יָלַד, ^{יָקַר}יָקַר, ^{יָרַת}יָרַת. But the later Aramaic dialects vocalise this ^{יָ}יָ, and turn it into a simple vowel *i*. Hence in Syriac ^{ܝܕܥܝܬܐ}ܝܕܥܝܬܐ, ^{ܝܥܝܬܐ}ܝܥܝܬܐ, ^{ܝܥܝܬܐ}ܝܥܝܬܐ, ^{ܝܥܝܬܐ}ܝܥܝܬܐ, ^{ܝܥܝܬܐ}ܝܥܝܬܐ, which are commonly written in the oldest MSS. with prefixed *aleph*, ^{ܝܕܥܝܬܐ}ܝܕܥܝܬܐ, ^{ܝܥܝܬܐ}ܝܥܝܬܐ, etc.; and in Mandaitic ^{ܝܕܥܝܬܐ}ܝܕܥܝܬܐ, ^{ܝܥܝܬܐ}ܝܥܝܬܐ, or ^{ܝܕܥܝܬܐ}ܝܕܥܝܬܐ, ^{ܝܥܝܬܐ}ܝܥܝܬܐ. The verb ^{ܝܕܥܝܬܐ}ܝܕܥܝܬܐ, Mand. ^{ܝܕܥܝܬܐ}ܝܕܥܝܬܐ, also occurs in Syriac as ^{ܝܕܥܝܬܐ}ܝܕܥܝܬܐ, but the more common form is ^{ܝܕܥܝܬܐ}ܝܕܥܝܬܐ, which appears in the Talmūd Yērūshalmī as ^{ܝܕܥܝܬܐ}ܝܕܥܝܬܐ, in which form the *h* is elided and its vowel

¹ [The explanation of ^{יָדַע}יָדַע, "know," from the Arabic ^{وَدَعَ}وَدَعَ is due to Schultens but has not found general acceptance. The first radical of the verb "to know" is ^י not only in Hebrew, Aramaic and Ethiopic, but also in Sabaeen, and perhaps in Assyrian (see Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gramm.* p. 308). The verb therefore is now generally taken to be true פ'. Even in Arabic, as Nöldeke observes, there is a trace of a root ^{يَدَع}يَدَع distinct from ^{وَدَعَ}وَدَعَ (^{اِيْدَع}اِيْدَع). The forms with ^י after a prefix (^{יָדַע}יָדַע, ^{יָעַן}יָעַן, etc.) are to be explained in the same way as ^{ܝܕܥܝܬܐ}ܝܕܥܝܬܐ, ^{ܝܥܝܬܐ}ܝܥܝܬܐ, *infra*, p. 242.]

يَا حَمَّ، يَاجِجٌ. Thirdly, the vowel of the first syllable may be weakened into *i*, and give us the forms يَاجِجٌ، يَاجِجٌ، يَاجِجٌ. Lastly, the vulgar forms of the present day are يَاقِفٌ، يَاقِفٌ، instead of يَاقِفٌ، يَاقِفٌ، يَاقِفٌ. We also find at the present day in Egypt the forms *yīkaf*, *yīka*, *yīsal*, and *yakif*, *yakī*, but they are comparatively rare.

Let us glance now at Hebrew. Here one form of the imperfect is represented by יִקַּר، יִשֵּׁב، יִרַד، תִּלַּד، apparently identical with the normal Arabic يَرِيحُ، تَلِدُ. The *a* was weakened as usual into *i*, and then lengthened before the tone into ē, תִּילַד، יִירַד، for *tilid*, *yirid*. A form like יִקַּר is against Arabic rule; and forms like יִרַעַם، יִרַעַם، show that the *ṣere* was retained in the 2nd syllable before the tone, which has led some to think that it might have a diphthongal origin. They would derive יִרַעַם، יִירַד، תִּילַד، from יִירַעַם، יִירַד، תִּילַד، according to the dialectical Arabic يَاجِجٌ، يَاجِجٌ. Another form of the Hebrew imperfect is represented by יִירַשׁ، יִקַּר (as well as יִקַּר، יִירַשׁ). Here we have, no doubt, the dialectical Arabic يَاجِجٌ، يَاجِجٌ. The original *a* of the 1st syllable became *i*, and this worked the change of *w* into *y*. In one word, יִרַבַּל، the imperfect יִרַבַּל resembles in form the vulgar Arabic يَاقِفٌ. We may consider it as the last weakening of an original יִרַבַּל، יִרַבַּל.

Passing on to the Aramaic dialects, we find in Syriac the imperfect written with an *alaph*, نִלַּד، نִלַּד. It seems to me that the original pronunciation was *nâladh*, *nârath*, as in the dialect-

¹ [But comp. p. 180.]

tical Arabic *يَا جَل*, *يَا جَع*; and that *ā* was weakened into *ē* (for which we have abundant analogies), whence the Eastern forms *بَنَجَ*, *بَنَجَ*. Others think, however, that this form arose by assimilation of the verbs *ف"ف* and *ف"ا*, such as *نَاصَل*, *نَاصَل*.

The Western Syrians weakened the *ē* still further into *ī*, *بَنَجَ*, *بَنَجَ*, as in the verbs *ف"ا*, *ف"ا*. In Mandaitic the first syllable has *ī*, probably *ī*, as *עִהַב*, "I give," *נִיקָאָר*, *נִיקָאָר* or *נִיקָאָר*; *עִדּוּל* and *תִּדּוּל*, from *עִדּוּל*. These forms with *u* in the second syllable are remarkable.

Let us next examine the imperative mood.

In Ethiopic, where the initial *w* is lost in the subjunctive, it also disappears in the imperative. We occasionally find such forms as *ፀቀር*: or *ፀቀር*: "hew, cut out," *ፀገር*: "pelt, stone"; but the usual ones are *ቅር*: or *ቀር*:, *ገር*: or *ገር*:, *ረር*:, *ሀር*:, *ባር*:. In Arabic, all verbs that lose the *w* in the imperfect, also drop it in the imperative; hence *هَب*, *قَع*, *رَد*, *رَث*, *عَد*. In those that retain the *w*, it is necessarily changed, on account of the prosthetic vowel, into a letter of prolongation; *اَوْجَلْ* for *اِيَجَلْ* from

اَوْضُو for *اَوْضُو* from *اَوْضُو*. The vulgar form of the present day in Egypt is *uḵaf*, *uṣal*, *uḵa'*, *uḥin*, *uḥid*; more rarely *ikaf*, *ikā'*, *iṣal*, or *kif*.

In Hebrew the forms waver somewhat: *יָצַב*, *יָצַב*, *יָצַב*; but perhaps *יָצַב* (Judg. v. 13). On the other hand, *יָצַב*, *יָצַב*, *יָצַב* (Deut. xxxiii. 23) but also *יָצַב* and *יָצַב*, and even *יָצַב* as well as *יָצַב* "pour." In Syriac, on the contrary, the initial letter is retained in the imperative, with the exception of *سَب* from *سَب*, *سَب* from *سَب*, and *سَب* from *سَب*. In Mandaitic the form is not common in the extant literature. Noeldeke gives no

examples but עָתִיב and תִּיב "sit"; הָאֵב "give," with the curious variations עָהוּב, אָהוּב, and before enclitics with הֵ, in the singular, הָבָא and אָרְבָּא, plur. הָבוּ and אָרְבוּ.

In Arabic, the verbs which drop the initial *h* in the imperfect and imperative usually lose it also in one of the commonest forms of the infinitive, taking, as a sort of compensation, the feminine termination; e.g. لَدَّةٌ as well as لَدٌ, and وَلَدَةٌ or الْوَلَدَةُ; عَطَّةٌ, as well as عَطٌ, and وَعْدَةٌ, as well as وَعْدٌ; أَرَبْتُ, as well as أَرَبْتُ, and رَثْتُ, as well as رَثْتُ. Precisely corresponding infinitives in Hebrew, as יָרָה, יָרָה; generally however, יָרָה, יָרָה, יָרָה, יָרָה (for יָרָה), for *lilat*, etc. In יָרָה the *pathachs* are due to the guttural, as in يَرَى, يَرَى. The masculine form יָרָה in Job is a rarity, and equally so the contracted feminine יָרָה in 1 Sam. iv. 19. Examples of the fuller form are יָרָה, יָרָה (Ps. xxx. 4), יָרָה. The Ethiopic supplies us with many substantives of this class, but not infinitives, as ልደት: ርደት: ሰለት: ፀለት:: In Aramaic there are likewise a few, e.g. עָטָא, Dan. ii. 14; מְבָלָא, מְבָלָא; חֲבָלָא: חֲבָלָא is probably to be regarded as borrowed from the Hebrew עָרָה.

Passing on to the derived conjugations, I would first direct your notice to the transitive or causative *Hiph'il*, in Hebrew הוֹלִיד. The presence of the ה is sufficient guarantee that the verb originally began with this letter; an original פ must have yielded הוֹלִיד. The Arabic and Ethiopic have preserved for us the purer form ^{أولَدَ}أولَدَ, ሰለደ: in Syriac ܐܠܕ, ܐܠܕ. In the passive *Hoph'al*, the weak consonant is vocalised, הוּשַׁב for הוּשַׁב, as in Arabic أولِدَ for أولَدَ.

In the same way, in the reflexive and passive *Niphl'al*, the Hebrew נִלְד stands for נִלְדָּ, according to the form נִקְטַל, whereas יִלְד is by assimilation from יִנְלָד, corresponding to an Arabic يَنْوَلِد from أَنْوَلَد. Such forms, though not uncommon in the modern language, are not deemed classical.

The *reflexive conjugations* formed with the prefix *ta* require a little more attention.

The simplest is the Aramaic *Ethpe'il*. Of this the oldest shape is to be discerned in the Ethiopic ተወለደ: "be born," ተወለ: "be given." In Syriac it always appears with vocalised *y*, ܝܠܕܝܬܐ for 'eth-*y*-lādh, and that from 'eth-*w*-lādh, ܝܠܕܝܬܐ. In Mandaitic however the vowelless *yodh* is dropped, giving ܥܬܝܗܒ, מיתלד; but "she was given" is ܥܬܝܗܒܬܐ, as in Syr. ܥܬܝܗܒܬܐ. The corresponding conjugation in Arabic is, as you may remember, the 8th, *ifta'ala*, تَفَعَّلَ for اِفْتَعَلَ. This should give us اَوْتَعَلَ; but these impossible forms necessarily become اِيتَعَلَ, اِيتَفَقَ, اِيتَكَل, the existence of which is admitted, although the assimilation of *wt* into *tt* is greatly preferred: اَتَعَلَ, اَتَفَقَ, اَتَكَل. The imperf. of the former is يَتَعَد, يَتَفَق, يَتَكَل; of the latter يَاتَعَد, يَاتَفَق, يَاتَكَل. So usual has this assimilation become that many secondary roots beginning with *t* have been formed from this conjugation; e.g. تَلَد "to be born in one's house, be hereditary"; تَسَع "be wide," تَقِيَ "fear God," تَكَن "rely on," اَتَلَج "insert," اَتَمَّ "suspect." In Syriac ܬܠܐ is an example of this sort¹.

¹ [Prof. Wright's ms. cites also ܬܠܐ, late Heb. תָּלַן, which some scholars

הִמְיִן. יֵצֵר is doubtful, and may be פ"ו; at least the Niph'al is נִצָּר, Is. xliii. 10. The imperfects are יִצַּק, יִצַּב, יִצַּח, יִצַּח, according to the Arabic form يِئَاق for يِئَاق; but instances of assimilation occur, as יִצַּח (1 Kings iii. 15), יִצַּח (1 Sam. vi. 12), יֵצֵר. The Hiph'il is הִצִּיב for הִצִּיב, הִצִּיק, הִצִּיל, הִמְיִן, but the original diphthong is retained in הִיִּשֵּׁר, Prov. iv. 25, Ps. v. 9 (Kěřē). In two cases the form הִוְשִׁיר seems to be used, falsely conforming to verbs פ"ו, viz. Ps. v. 9 (Kěthibh), and Is. xlv. 2 (Kěthibh). The same has happened with הוֹבִישׁ, Syr. ܠܗܝܫܐ; and with the Niph'al נִצָּח. The Niph'al of יֵצֵר is likewise, as we have seen, נִצָּר (Is. liii. 10), and its Hoph'al יוֹצֵר (Is. liv. 17). The latter form would be quite *en règle* from a verb פ"ו, because in Arabic too أَيْبَس would become in the passive أُؤْيِس, for أَيْبَس, the ي conforming to the preceding vowel. In Syriac ܐܝܬܐ and ܐܝܬܐ are the only words that exhibit the radical *y*, and the latter of these has a second form ܐܝܬܐ, which seems to have carried the day in Mandaitic, if we may judge by the word מוֹנָקָא "foster, guardian," for מאוֹנָקָא. The Mand. equivalent of ܐܝܬܐ is also ܐܝܬܐ. In the 8th conj. of the Arabic the same assimilation takes place as in verbs פ"ו, e.g. ٱتَّقِن, ٱتَّسَّر, ٱتَّبَس.

II. B. *Verbs of which the middle radical is w or y.*

In treating of these verbs, ע"ו and ע"ו in Hebrew Grammar, we must, at the outset, distinguish carefully between verbs that never undergo contraction, and those which, according to my view, are generally or always contracted. To the former class, for example, belong in Arabic many verbs of the form فَعَلَ, as سَوَلَ "to be flaccid" or "pendu-

lous," حور "to be very white and black" (of the eye), عور "to be one-eyed," حول "to squint," ميد "to have the disease called ^سميد" (of a camel), غيد "to be tender and flexible"; in Hebrew, חור "be white," צוע "expire," צוח "cry out," רוח "be airy and wide," איב "be hostile to," עיף "be weary"; in Syriac, مَعْد "be white," هَفْ "leap," زَسْ "rejoice"; and in all three languages verbs that are also ^ل or ^ل, as روي, رוח, زَسب, هوي, ^ل and ^ل. What principle guided the Semitic languages in the contraction or non-contraction of verbs ע' and ע', I am unable to state. I do not know why خُوف became خَاف, and مَوْتُ, whilst حَوْل and عَوْر remained uncontracted; neither can I tell you why the Hebrew says צוח, while the Arab changed his صَاح into صَاح¹.

The uncontracted verbs ע' and ע' we may pass over altogether, as their inflexion is exactly like that of the regular verb. It is only the contracted ones that require our attention. And here I may remark that some grammarians of note, among them Aug. Müller, Noeldeke and Stade, regard this class as actual specimens of biliteral roots. Stade, for example, calls them *mittelvocalig*, "having a vowel in the middle," and denies altogether the correctness of the term ע', for says he (p. 109) "these roots never had a consonant ^ל in the second place." For my own part, I prefer the older view, which is held by the Arab grammarians themselves, and for which I think we shall discover many good reasons as we go along.

The question of the existence of verbs ע' in Hebrew has been

¹ [With the exception of verbs which have ^ל as their third radical (e.g. לוח, ^ל), all those verbs in which middle ^ל or ^ל is treated as a consonant, appear to be denominatives and to have been formed at a relatively late period.—N.]

finally settled by Noeldeke in the *ZDMG.* xxxvii. p. 525, in the affirmative [as against the view of Ewald that such forms as שִׁים and בִּין are not true 'ע' verbs but shortened Hiph'als from roots 'ע]. To this article I refer you for all necessary information on the subject.

If you consult the Arab grammarians, they will tell you that such words as قَامَ, خَافَ and طَالَ, had originally a و in the second place, which has generally been vocalised; whence it comes that its place is occupied by a long vowel, which must under certain circumstances be shortened. The rules for these processes are few and simple.

(1) If three open syllables follow one another in succession the first of which has short *ā* and the other two any of the three vowels, then the vowel of the second syllable is rejected, and the second radical is changed into long *ā*. Hence قَوْل becomes قَالَ, خَوْف becomes خَاف, طَوْل becomes طَالَ. If, however, the first radical has *u* and the second *i*, the latter vowel, as being the clearer, generally predominates, so that قَوْل becomes قِيل; although some of the Arabs contracted the form more regularly into قُول, whilst others gave the long vowel the intermediate sound of *ii*, *kūla*.

(2) If the 1st radical be vowelless, and the 2nd and 3rd radicals have vowels, then the vowel of the second is thrown back upon the 1st, and the و or ي becomes the corresponding letter of prolongation or long vowel. Hence يَقُول becomes يَقِيْمٌ يَقِيْمٌ, اِقَامَ اَقُوْمٌ, يَتَقَال يَقُوْلٌ, يَخَاف يَخُوْفٌ, يَقُوْل يَقُوْلٌ. Should the final radical under any circumstances lose its vowel, then the preceding long vowel must be shortened. The jussive يَقُوْل becomes يَقُل, يَخَاف يَخُف, يَتَقَال يَقُل. اقَامَت يَقِيْمٌ يَقِيْمٌ. A further consequence of these changes is that the imperative of the 1st conjugation drops the now

useless prosthetic *alif*; **أَقُولُ** becomes **أَقُلُ**, **أَقُلُ**, **قُلُ**; or perhaps we may rather say that it never required the prosthetic *alif*, for the original **قَوْل** would naturally become **قُول** and then **قُلُ**.

(3) In the perfect of the 1st conjugation, when the first radical has *a* and the third is vowelless, contraction takes place, but the vowel of the first radical is affected either by the consonant or the vowel of the middle syllable. Hence **قَوِّمْتَ** becomes, not **فَمِتَ**, but **قَمِتَ**, through the influence of the *و*, and **سَيَّرْتَ** becomes **سَرَّتَ**, through the influence of the *ي*; but **خَوِّفْتَ** becomes **خَفَّتَ**, not **خَفَّتَ** or **خَفَّتَ**, through the influence of the vowel *i*, which is characteristic of the intransitive form. Where these influences are combined, their operation is of course the more certain; **طَوَّلْتَ** can become nothing but **هَبَّتَ**, and **هَيَّيْتَ** nothing but **هَبَّتَ**.

So much for the Arabic rules. Let us next study the forms of the Ethiopic, Hebrew and Syriac paradigms as compared with those of the Arabic.

The Arabic **قام** stands, as we have seen, for **خاف**, **قوم** for **خوف**, **طال** for **طول**. The corresponding Ethiopic forms **ረገ፡** "run," **ቀለ፡** "conquer," **ሐረ፡** "go," **በለ፡** "come," **ሀሌ፡** "set," **ሓለ፡** "turn," are not identical with the Arabic, for the Arabic long *a* does not ordinarily become *ô* or *ê* in Ethiopic. The Ethiopic forms have been obtained by simple rejection of the vowel of the second radical, and subsequent change of the resulting diphthongs *au*, *ai*, into *ô*, *ê*. Thus *rawaşa*, *sayama*, became *rauşa*, *sayma*, and then *rôşa*, *sêma*. These vowels are retained throughout the whole inflexion of the perfect, **ረገተ፡** **ረገከ፡** **ሀለተ፡** **ሀለከ፡** etc. The Hebrew form of the 3rd pers. sing. masc. is still more peculiar, and indeed very hard to explain. As Arabic long *a* regularly becomes *ô* in Hebrew, we should have expected

קָוַם to yield *kôm* as the equivalent of *قَامَ kâma*, and not *kām*.

How then is this form *kām*, קָם, from *kām*, to be explained?

Assimilation to the class *ע"ע* can scarcely have been in operation, for קָם is always carefully distinguished from *כַּב* in its

punctuation, and besides the fem. and plur. are קָמָה, קָמוּ, not

קָמָה, קָמוּ. It would seem as if, in this case, the Hebrew, attaching more weight than the Arab did to the characteristic vowel of the form, had shortened the original *kawam* into *kam*, and then derived the other persons from this shortened form as a base¹. Similarly, the Hebrew differs from the Arabic in the turn which it gives to verbs with *u* and *i* in the second syllable.

The Arab changes *مَوْتُ* into *مَاتَ*, and *طَوَّلَ* into *طَالَ*: but the

Hebrew attached more weight to the vowels as characteristic of the intransitive form, and spoke not *māth*, but *מִית* *mīth* (for *mit*, from *marvit*); not *bāsh* or *'ār*, but *בוֹשֵׁת* *bōsh* and *אוֹר* *'ôr* (for *bush* and *'ur*, from *bawush*, *'awur*). These forms resemble those of the Arabic 2nd pers. *خَوَّفْتَ*, *مَوَّتَ*, *طَلَّتْ*, *خَفَّتْ*, *مَتَّ*, *طَوَّلَتْ*.

In Aramaic the ordinary form is precisely what we should expect, with long *ā* corresponding to the Arabic *ā*; e.g.

קָם, שָׁם, חָם, חָם; Mand. קאם, פאיש "remain"; but *ܡܝܬ*, Mand. מית, corresponding to Heb. *מִית*. The 3rd pers. sing.

fem. is in Arabic *سَارَتْ*, *طَالَتْ*, *خَافَتْ*, *مَاتَتْ*, *قَامَتْ*. The

Heb. *קָמָה*, *בָּאָה*, *מָתָה*, *בוֹשָׁה*, with the tone ordinarily on the 1st syllable, are derived directly from the forms of the masc.

קָם, *מִית*, *בוֹשֵׁת*; but we also find *וְשָׁבַת*, with older termination,

Ezek. xlv. 17. The Aramaic forms are *ܣܦܬ*, Dan. iv. 30; Syr.

¹ It may be, however, that the sound of the vowel was even still somewhat longer than that of *ā*, something between it and *ā*, as the spelling קאם in Hos. x. 14 may seem to indicate.

נִאֲדָאת, קִאֲמָאת; Mand. ܢܝܕܬܐ, ܩܝܡܬܐ; Similarly in the 3rd pers. plur., سَارُوا, طَالُوا, خَافُوا, عَاتُوا, قَامُوا, corresponding to Aramaic, שָׁמוּ, Dan. iii. 12, קָמוּ, Ezra v. 2; Syr. ܫܡܘܐ, ܩܡܘܐ; Mand. ܩܝܡܬܐ, ܦܝܫܘܒܬܐ (without ܐ), in the fuller form קִאֲמִיּוֹן, פִּאֲשִׁיּוֹן. The Heb. בָּשְׂמוּ, מָתוּ, קָמוּ, קָרוּ, with the tone usually on the 1st syllable, are derived directly from the corresponding singulars, קָם, etc.

In the 2nd pers. sing. and its analogous forms we find a still greater variety among the dialects. In Arabic the 2nd pers. sing. masc. is طَلْتَ, مِتَّ, خَفْتَ, قَمْتَ, or from a verb medial

هَبْتَ, سِرْتَ. Here the vowels *u* and *i* are due respectively either to the influence of the last radical و or ي, or of the characteristic vowel *u* or *i*: خَوْنَتْ = خَفْتَ, قَوْنَتْ = قَمْتَ; هَيِّبَتْ = هَبْتَ, سَيَّرَتْ = سِرْتَ, طَوْلَتْ = طَلْتَ, عَوَّوَتْ = مِتَّ.

In Hebrew the form is גִּרְתִּי, סִרְתָּם, שִׁמְתָּ, בִּנְתָּה, קָמְתָּ, with short *ā*, and *kāmeš* (*ā*) appears only in pause, קָמְתִּי, Micha vii. 8, סִרְתִּי, Ps. cxix. 102, שִׁמְתִּי, Jerem. xxxiii. 25. Before Kimhi's time, however, even the ordinary forms used to be pointed with *kāmeš*, קָמְתָּ, שִׁמְתָּ, at least when the accent was *mil'el*. From מַת we have, unexpectedly, מָתְנוּ (we should have expected מִתְנוּ), and in pause וּמָתִי, Gen. xix. 19, but also וּמָתְנוּ. From verbs with *ō* we get בָּשְׂתִּי, בָּשְׂתִּי (for *busht*, *bushti*, *bushnu*). On the other hand, the long vowel is steadily preserved in the Aramaic, not merely in the 1st pers., שָׁמַת, Ezra vi. 12, Syr. ܫܡܬܐ, ܩܝܡܬܐ, Mand. ܩܝܡܬܐ, ܦܝܫܘܒܬܐ; but also

in the second, שָׁמַתְּ Dan. iii. 10, Syr. ܫܡܬܐ, ܫܡܬܐ, Mand. ܫܡܬܐ = ܫܡܬܐ, ܫܡܬܐ = ܫܡܬܐ "didst teach."

Passing on to the imperative, we find the Arabic forms to be such as سِرُّوا, خَفُّوا, قُمُوا. But the plurals are سِيرُوا, خَفُّوا, قُمُوا; fem. سِيرِي, خَفِّي, قُمِي. In vulgar Arabic the shortening of the sing. forms is neglected, كُُلْ *kūl*, بَيِّعْ *bīʿ*: unless an accus. suffix or an enclitic prep. follows, as *shil-nī* "carry me," *kul-lī*, *kul-lūhum*. In Ge'ez the corresponding forms are ܬܬܐܬܐ, ܬܬܐܬܐ; ܬܬܐܬܐ, ܬܬܐܬܐ; ܬܬܐܬܐ, ܬܬܐܬܐ, exactly like the Heb. קָוַם; קָוַם; בּוּא; בּוּא; ܬܬܐܬܐ. In Hebrew קָוַם stands for קָוַם; but בּוּא was originally *bāʿ*, for בּוּא; בּוּא; *bīshū*, for *bēʿashū*; אָוַר; אָוַר, for *ʾāwār*. In Ge'ez the form ܬܬܐܬܐ is difficult to explain; perhaps we may regard it as an example of the change of *ā* into *ô*, and as therefore standing for *hâr*; if so, then the other form ܬܬܐܬܐ is only a weakening of the original ܬܬܐܬܐ, brought about by the influence of the common form ܬܬܐܬܐ. In Aramaic we find nothing unusual; Bibl. קָוַם Dan. vii. 5, שָׁוַם Ezra iv. 21; Syr. ܫܡܬܐ, ܫܡܬܐ; Mand. ܫܡܬܐ, ܫܡܬܐ. The verb ܫܡܬܐ, ܫܡܬܐ, has ܫܡܬܐ, ܫܡܬܐ, Mand. ܫܡܬܐ; and in Mand. there is one example with *α*, viz. ܫܡܬܐ "dwell," by assimilation to the class *y'y*.

For the imperfect indicative the Arabic has the three forms يَسِيرُ, يَخُوفُ, يَقُومُ, standing respectively for يَسِيرُ, يَخُوفُ, يَقُومُ. The peculiar Ge'ez indicative may be exemplified by such words as ܬܬܐܬܐ, ܬܬܐܬܐ, ܬܬܐܬܐ, ܬܬܐܬܐ. It is only the forms of the subjunctive that we can compare with the Arabic indicative. Here then we have ܬܬܐܬܐ, ܬܬܐܬܐ, ܬܬܐܬܐ, ܬܬܐܬܐ. The verb ܬܬܐܬܐ: "to go," has the same double formation as in the imperative, viz. ܬܬܐܬܐ: as well as ܬܬܐܬܐ:, which we must explain

in the same way. — In Hebrew the preformatives have usually retained the original vowel *a*, as יָשׁוּם, יָבוֹא, יָקוּם, corresponding exactly to the three Arabic forms, since יָבוֹא was originally *yabā'u*; other examples may be the very doubtful יָדוֹן, Gen. vi. 3, and יָקוּט, Job viii. 14. The only instance of the weakening of the preformative to *i* is יִבוֹשׁ, for *yabwashu*, *yabāsh*, *yibāsh*, *yebōsh*. The jussives of יִסְיֵר, יִיֶּחָאֵף, יִיֶּחָרֵם are in Arabic يَیْصِر, يَیْخُفُّ, and to these correspond in Hebrew יִשֵּׁם, יִתָּרֵם, יִתָּיֵשׁ, still farther shortened with vāv conversive into וְיִתָּרֵם, וְיִתָּיֵשׁ. If however the last radical be ר or a guttural, then *ā* is substituted for *ō* or *ā*, as וְיִנָּח, וְיִסָּר, וְיִרָח; except וְיִגָּר, וְיִתָּגֵר. In the 3rd pers. plur. fem. we should expect, after the analogy of the Arabic يَسِرْنَ, يَخْفُنَ, يَتَمَنَّ, a Hebrew form תִּבְנִינָה, and this actually occurs in תִּשְׁבְּנוּ, Exod. xvi. 55, (for *tabina*, *tabwāna*), תִּגְלִינָה; but more frequently this form is assimilated to that of verbs ע' ע', and a diphthongal יַי inserted, with consequent restoration of the long vowel, תִּמוּטִינָה, תִּשׁוּבִינָה. The Aramaic forms of the imperfect are just what we should naturally expect, viz. נִסְמַס, נִבְסַס, יָקוּם. There is however another form in use, viz. Syr. נִבְסַס, Mand. and Talmud. נִיקוּם. In Syriac I can scarcely remember any but singular forms, נִבְסַס, נִבְסַס, though نَقَمَ is quoted¹: but in Mand. the plural is נִימִיתוֹן, f. נִימִיתָא, etc., while in the verb קוּם the vowel of the 2nd syllable is rejected, נִיקְמוֹן, f. נִיקְמָא. These Mandaitic forms coincide with those from verbs ע' ע' in the same dialect, as תִּירִיגוֹן from רָגַג, “sprinkle,” from נָזַז, and the Syriac variation must be traced to a similar assimilation of ע' ע'.

¹ [نَقَمَ] is demanded by the metre in Ephr. Syr., iii. 316 A.—N.]

to ע"ע. The verb מָלַךְ, מַלְכָּה, מַלְכֻת has in all the dialects יִמְלוֹךְ, יִמְלוֹת, like יִבְלֵה from יָבַל, or יִבְסֵה from יָבַס. In Mandaitic we find a future in *a*, עֲדָאָר, נִידָאָר, "dwell," by assimilation to the class ע"ע.

The infinitive construct in Hebrew has the simple form קוֹם, for קוּם, as in the regular verb קָטַל for קָטֵל. The form בּוֹא, probably springs from a long *â*, *bâ'*, 'âr, *bâsh*, for *barwa'*, 'arwar, *barwash*.—In the infinitive absolute on the contrary, מוֹת, מוֹתָ, מוֹתָה, are contractions of *saawir*, *shawab*, *maawith*.—The Aramaic infinitive is מִקָּם, Syr. مَقَم, for مَقَمٌ: the same variation occurs as in the imperfect, especially in Mandaitic and Talmudic i.e. מִקָּם, מִקָּאָם, מִקָּאָן, מִקָּאָה, Talm. מִקָּם, מִימָה, מִימָה, מִימָה, but the emphatic form of מִקָּם in Mandaitic is מִקָּמָא, as if from a verb ע"ע.

The original form of the participle active must have been سَائِرٌ, قَائِمٌ; but in the contracted verbs the و at the beginning of the syllable was changed into *hamza*, قَائِمٌ, and the verbs mediae followed this analogy, سَائِرٌ. These forms are liable to a rare contraction into سَائِرٌ as سَائِرٌ for سَائِرٌ "armed," هَائِرٌ for هَائِرٌ "feeble," سَائِسٌ for سَائِسٌ "going about," طَائِفٌ for طَائِفٌ "decayed" (a tooth), مَائِدٌ for مَائِدٌ "cowardly." To this corresponds the rare Hebrew form לוֹט, Is. xxv. 7, בּוֹסִים, Zach. x. 5, קוֹמִים, 2 Kings xvi. 7, for *liṭ*, *bâs*, *kām*. The more usual form is however analogous to that of the perf., viz. בָּא, fem. בָּאָה, זָר, fem. זָרָה, נִשְׁאָטִים, sometimes written with א, as לָאֵט, Judg. iv. 21, נִשְׁאָטִים, Ezek. xxviii. 24, 26, נִשְׁאָטִים, Ezek. xvi. 57, רָאֵשׁ, 2 Sam. xii. 1, 4, Prov. x. 4 (compare the perf. קָאָם, Hos. x. 14). This form

seems to me to be best explained as arising from a nominal *kaṭal*, i.e. *ṣawāim, rawāṣ, barwā'*, contracted after the analogy of the perfect into *ṣam, raṣ, ba'*. In the same way in intrans. verbs, with *ē* and *ō* in the second syllable, e.g. מֵת for מוֹת (*marwūt, mit*), לֵין for לוֹין (*lawāṣ, liṣ*), בּוֹשׁ for בוֹשׁ (*barwāsh, bush*), according to the Heb. יָגַר, כָּבַד, or the Arabic adjectives يَغْزُرُ, يَقْطُرُ. In Aramaic similar phenomena recur. In Bibl. Aram. the form is קָאם Dan. ii. 31. plur. in *Kēthībh* דְּאֵנִין, דְּאֵרִין, זְאֵעִין, emph. קָאמִיא, constr. דְּאֵרִי. The *Kēre* usually substitutes י for א in these plur. forms, דְּיֵנִין, זְיֵעִין, דְּיֵרִי. In Syriac only the singular is written with ܐ, ܐܝܡ, pronounced however, we are told, *kāyēm*. The fem. and plurals are invariably with *yūd*, ܐܝܡܐ, ܐܝܡܝܐ. In Mandaic the י is written in the sing. masc. too, ܡܝܝܬ, ܡܝܝܬܐ, fem. ܡܝܝܡܐ.—The passive participle of the Hebrew is exemplified by מוּל, סוּג, fem. לוּטָה, for *marwūt, sawwīg, lēwūtāh*. In Aramaic the corresponding form is ܡܝܠܐ, ܡܝܠܐ, Mand. ܡܝܠܐ, “depicted,” ܢܝܠܐ “measured,” for *sēyīm, lēwūt*, etc.

I shall now proceed to the derived conjugations of these verbs, and go through them as rapidly as possible.

1. *Pi'ēl*. The uncontracted verbs form their Pi'ēl quite regularly; e.g. ܥܘܪ, ܥܘܪܐ, ܥܘܪܐ, “to blind of one eye,” ܥܘܪܐ “bend,” ܥܘܪܐ “leap in numbers.” The contracted ones too exhibit the normal form, that is to say, the weak letter, being strengthened by doubling, undergoes no change or only a slight one. In Arabic, for example, we have ܥܘܪܐ, ܥܘܪܐ, ܥܘܪܐ; in Ge'ez ܥܘܪܐ: “inspect,” “visit,” ܥܘܪܐ: “cry out”; in Heb. ܥܘܪ “surround,” Ps. cxix. 61: Aram. ܥܘܪ, ܥܘܪܐ, Syr. ܥܘܪܐ, ܥܘܪܐ; Mand. ܥܘܪܐ. But more frequently the middle consonant appears as a *y*, the origin of which I explain thus.

In a form like *kaucēm*, the initial of the second syllable was changed in Hebrew and Aramaic into *y*, *kaucēm* (comp. רָיַע, דָּוָא; هَوِيَ, הָיָה, הָיָה), whence, by assimilation of the preceding letter, *kaiyēm*. and finally *kijyēm*. So in Aram. קָיַם, סָמַם, חָיַב, אָסַם, בָּסַם, etc. In Hebrew forms like קָיַם, חָיַב, belong to the later stage of the language. In place of Pi^{al} the Hebrew frequently exhibits another formation, viz. *Pilēl*, of which the older form was *Pa^{al}al*, as בּוֹסַם, עוֹרַר, רוֹבֵם, קוֹבֵם, etc., for *kaumam*, *raumam*, etc.

2. *Hiplēl* and *Hophēl*. The contracted Arabic form is أَفْلَحَ, أَفْلَحَ, for أَفْلَحَ, أَفْلَحَ. To this correspond in Ge'ez አፍረ፡, አፍረ፡, which seem to be taken directly from the simple forms ፍረ፡, ሐረ፡, ስረ፡. Some verbs however exhibit a short *a* in the 2nd syllable, which before a final guttural may become *ē*; e.g. አቀፎ፡ 'akāma; አፈሎ፡ 'andma, as well as አፍፎ፡; አፈፈ፡ 'atāka, "hem in," as well as አፍፈ፡; አፈፈ፡ 'anēḥa, "lengthen"; አብሎ፡ 'abē'a "bring or put in"; አብሐ፡ 'abēha, "permit." Such words seem to be really derived from the old form 'akwāma, 'anwāma, 'abwē'a, etc.; perhaps with doubling of the first letter by way of compensation, as in הִפִּיתָ, הִפִּיתָ.—The Hebrew form הִפִּיתָ stands far below the Arabic and Ge'ez. The original *hakwāma* must have already passed through the stages of *hakwām*, *hikwām*, *hikwām*, *hikīm*, before it could become *hikīm*. The 2nd pers. of the Hebrew is likewise far removed from the purity of the Arabic أَقَمَّتْ, أَقَمَّتْ, أَقَمَّتْ. The purer form does indeed occur in such cases as הִנַּחְתָּ, הִנַּחְתָּ, הִנַּחְתָּ, plur. הִנַּחְתֶּם, הִנַּחְתֶּם; but commonly an assimilation to verbs עָע is effected by the insertion of *ō*, for original *ā*, in which case the vowel of the preformative is usually *ā*, sometimes *ē*, and the vowel of the radical syllable sometimes *ē* instead of *ī*; as הִעִירְתָּ, הִעִירְתָּ, הִעִירְתָּ, והִסִּירְתָּ, הִסִּירְתָּ, הִסִּירְתָּ, plur. הִסִּירְתֶּם, הִסִּירְתֶּם; and in the plur. הִפִּצְתֶּם, הִפִּצְתֶּם, הִפִּצְתֶּם, הִפִּצְתֶּם; and in the plur. הִפִּצְתֶּם, הִפִּצְתֶּם, הִפִּצְתֶּם, הִפִּצְתֶּם.

הַשְׁבַּתָּם, הַבִּיאתָם, הַבִּינֹתָם. The Aramaic perfect is in the Old Testament הָקִים, וְהָקִים, הָתִיב; 2nd sing. הִקִּימָהּ, 1st sing. הִקִּימַת, 3rd plur. הִקִּימוּ; in Syr. ܐܩܡܐ, ܐܩܡܐ; in Mand. ܐܩܡܐ. In this last dialect the 1st pers. seems often to be identical in form with that of verbs ע"ע, e.g. ܐܩܡܐ, ܐܩܡܐ, "I despised," but ܐܩܡܐ, ܐܩܡܐ.—The imperfect is in Arabic ܐܩܡ for ܐܩܡ, with the jussive ܐܩܡ and imperative ܐܩܡ. In Ge'ez the imperfect indicative is ܐܩܡ: ܐܩܡ, the subjunctive ܐܩܡ: ܐܩܡ, imperative ܐܩܡ: ܐܩܡ. But verbs of the form ܐܩܡ: ܐܩܡ have in the subjunctive ܐܩܡ: ܐܩܡ, imperative ܐܩܡ: ܐܩܡ. In Hebrew יָקַם stands for *ya-hakwim*, *yakwim*: the jussive is יָקַם, the vowel of which is still further shortened with ܐ *conversive* into ܐܩܡ. In Aramaic the corresponding form is ܐܩܡ, ܐܩܡ: but in Syriac the form ܐܩܡ, participle ܐܩܡ, is admissible, and this is the only one found in Mandaitic, e.g. ܐܩܡ, ܐܩܡ. These are all assimilated to verbs ע"ע, as appears from the plur. ܐܩܡܐ as compared with ܐܩܡܐ, "afflicting them."—The passive of this conjugation in Arabic is ܐܩܡ for ܐܩܡ. In Hebrew the original *hukwama* would naturally become *hukāma*, *hukām*, but the form in actual use has been entirely assimilated to that of verbs הוּקַם, הוּקַם. In Syriac we have only the passive participle ܐܩܡ, for *mukwam*, *mukām*; but in Biblical Aramaic there is the remarkable survival הִקִּימָהּ Dan. vii. 4, wrongly pointed הִקִּמָּה in verse 5.

3. Of the reflexive conjugations with prefixed *ta*, I will only notice the *Ethpēl*, corresponding to the 8th conjugation of the Arabic. In Arabic the form is, of course, ܐܩܡܐ, contracted for

اجتوز; but the uncontracted form is used in many verbs either by itself or along with the other; e.g. اجتوروا or اجتاروا, اعتورا.

In Ge'ez the corresponding forms are ተሰፀከ: "be agitated," ተሰፀከ. The Aramaic of the Bible exhibits יתשמן, יתשם, מתשם, but also יתנין. The one form, התשם, comes directly from the original *tasayama*, *tasâma*. The doubling of the *t* may be an attempt to compensate for the radical which has disappeared by contraction, and so to give the word something of the outward form of the normal התקטל; or it may be merely imitated from the *Ethtafal* (*Ittaf'al*). The other form, התנין, has no doubt arisen by assimilation to the *Ethtafal* or reflex of *Af'el*, the two being completely confounded in Syriac. E.g. התנין is *Ethpe'el* of ין, ין or ין of שמ; but ין, ין, ין are *Ethtaf'als* from ין, ין, ין. In Mandaitic however the two conjugations can be readily distinguished; ניתלפון is *Ethpe'el* from לוף, *Ethtafal* from רום. I find however עתניהית "I was quieted," which seems to be *Ethpe'el*, whereas ין must be regarded as *Ethtafal*.

4. The last form to which I shall direct your attention is the reflexive and passive *Niphal*. The Arabic form may be exemplified by اِنْدَاسَ, اِنْقَادَ, for اِنْدَوسَ, اِنْقُودَ, imperf. يَنْدَاسُ, يَنْقَادُ. In Hebrew נדש was originally *nadash*, contracted from *nadwash*, as in the Arabic 4th conj. اَقَامَ from اَقُومَ; and so fem. נפוצה, plur. נפצו. One verb, נעור, exhibits the weakening of *a* to *i* in the preformative. The 1st and 2nd persons are assimilated to verbs ע"ע by the insertion of a vowel; viz. 2nd plur. נקטתם, נפצותם, with *o*; 1st pers. sing. נסוגתי, נפוגתי, נכנתי, with sinking of *o* to *u*. The infinitives have the form

הַטוֹחַ, הַמוֹל. The vowel *ô* (for *â*) is sunk to *â* in הַדִּישׁ (Isaiah xxv. 10); and the preformative is absorbed in לִאֹר (Job xxxiii. 30), if the reading be correct. The imperative is exemplified by הַכּוֹן for *hinkân* (*hinkatein*), הַמְלוֹ, הַרְמוּ, the last with irregular doubling of the *m*. The imperfect is, for example, יִכּוֹן for *yinkân*, from *yankatein*, יִנּוּעַ, יַעֲוֹר, יִסְגּוּ, יִרְמוּ, with irregular doubling of the *m*.

Of the frequent and close resemblances in form between verbs עָוַע and עָוַע we have already had many examples. I may add to these such Hiph'ls as הִפְסִיג, with its Hoph'al הִפְסָג, and הִפִּית, which latter differs only in form from הִסִּית; whereas in some other cases the difference perhaps extends to the meaning as well, as הִנִּיחַ "cause to rest" and הִנִּיחַ "lay down." Similar is the Niph'al נִמּוֹל for *namâl* (*namwal*), Gen. xvii. 26, participle נִמְלִים, Gen. xxxiv. 22, for *namâlîm* (*namwalîm*).

II. C. Verbs of which the 3rd radical is *w* or *y*.

We now proceed to the large and important class of verbs in which the weak letter occupies the third place in the root. In our Hebrew Grammars these are generally called verbs הִלִּי, but as the ה is merely a vowel-letter, I prefer speaking of them as verbs לִי or לִי, according to circumstances. Verbs הִלִּי, strictly so called, are such as נָבַה, which pertain to a quite different class, *verba tertiæ gutturalis*.

In the *first conjugation*, the fullest form of the verbs of this class has been preserved in Ethiopic, where no contraction takes place in the perfect 3rd pers. sing. masc.: ተለዐ: *taláwa*, "follow"; በሐየ: *bukáya*, "weep"; ሐይዐ: *háywa*, "live"; ዐለየ: *álhya*, "be large"; ረየሃ: *ré'ya*, "see." The solitary instance that I remember of contraction is in a form corresponding to Heb. Pí'el, viz. ሀለ: *hallô*, for ሀለዐ: *halláwa* ["he was"], which are both in use. The final vowel was obviously dropped in this exceedingly common word, and the resulting diphthong *aw* then naturally passed into *ô*. — In Arabic the final *aw* appears as such only

in verbs of the form *فَعَلَ*, as *سَرَوْ* "to be noble," *حَلَوْ* "to be sweet." In verbs third *ي* such a form would be impossible: the final *ي* would at once influence the vowel *u* so as to change it into *i*, and the form *فَعَلَ*, if it ever occurred, would be indistinguishable from *فَعِلَ*, as *خَزِي* "be ashamed," *رَوِي* "be sated with drink." Not only so, however, but verbs third *و* of the form *فَعَلَ* are indistinguishable from verbs third *ي*, because the influence of the vowel *kasr* necessarily changes *و* into *ي*, as *رَضِي* "be pleased with," for *رَضَوْ*, *سَلِي* "be comforted or consoled," for *سَلَوْ*, *حَيَّو* for *حَيَّي* and *سَلَوْ*. These forms, be it observed, are all uncontracted (with the exception of *حَلِي*, which a false analogy has shortened into *حَلِي*); but in the most common form of all, *فَعَلَ*, the contraction, of which we found but a trace in Ethiopic, has become customary. *Tálarwa* and *bákaya* drop their final vowel, but the resulting diphthongal terminations *aw* and *ay* both pass in Arabic into *á*, *tálà*, *bákà*. For distinction's sake the grammarians bid us write *تَلَا* with *alif*, when the final radical is *aw*, and *بَكَّى* with *y*, when the final radical is *y*, but the sound is one and the same.

In Hebrew the tendency of the *י* to pass into *י* has almost obliterated the differences between verbs *לָיַן* and *לָיַי*. The radical *שָׁלַח* alone has preserved the final *aw* in such forms as *שָׁלַחְתִּי*, Job iii. 25, and, which is more remarkable, in an adjective of the form *שָׁלַח*, viz. *שָׁלַח* or *שָׁלַי*, Job xvi. 12, xxi. 23, Jerem. xlix. 31 (written *שָׁלַי*). Neither do intransitive verbs of the form *فَعِلَ* seem to occur in Hebrew, so that we have only verbs

of the form *فعل* to deal with. These follow exactly the same course as in Arabic; the final vowel was dropped, and the resulting diphthongal terminations passed into *â*, which the Hebrews expressed by the vowel-letter ה. In this way the original *taláwa*, *bakáya*, became *taláw*, *talá*; *bakáy*, *baká*; and were written תָּלָה "hang," בָּכָה "weep."

In Aramaic the intransitive forms are not very common, e.g., in Syriac, *ܫܠܝܬܐ*, *ܫܠܬܐ*, which stand for *shaliya*, *shaltwa*, and *hadiya*, *hadtwa*. So in Mandaitic, *ܥܡܝܠܝܐ* "he swore to me." The transitives have undergone the same contraction as in Hebrew, only that the termination is here usually expressed by *ܐ*, and the door thereby opened for further confusion, as in vulgar Arabic, with the entirely different verbs *لأ*, like *سَلَا*, *مَلَا*. The words *ܬܠܐ*, *ܬܠܐ* stand for *taláwa*, *bakáya*; whereas *ܬܠܐ*, *ܬܠܐ* were originally *ḥatá'a*, *malá'a*. Similarly in Mandaitic *ܪܘܐ* "saw," *ܫܬܐ* "drank," *ܒܐ* "sought for" (for *ܒܥܐ*). In the Bibl. Aram. *ܐ* and *ܗ* are used indifferently.

One verb in Aramaic constantly takes prosthetic aleph, viz. *ܐܫܬܝ* Dan. v. 3, 4, *ܐܫܬܝ*, for *ܫܬܝ*. I mention this for the sake of calling attention to the same phenomenon in vulgar Arabic (Spitta, p. 232), e.g. *ihkū* "he narrated," *iskū* "he gave water," *irmā* "he threw or pelted."

The 3rd pers. sing. fem. must of course originally have been, as in Ethiopic, *ተለወተ*: *taldwat*, *በከየተ*: *bakáyat*. (The contracted *ሀላ*: *hallō* [*infra*, p. 271] admits of a contracted *ሀላ*: *hallōt*, for *ሀለወተ*: *halláwat*.) In Arabic and Aramaic the intransitives are regular in formation, *شَلِيَتْ*, *خَزِيَتْ*, *رَضِيَتْ*; Syr. *ܫܠܝܬܐ*, for *shaliyat*, *shaliwat*; Mand. *ܡܝܫܝܐܬ* "arrived," *ܡܝܫܝܐܬ* "became dense or firm"; vulgar Arabic of Egypt, *mishiyet* "she went," from *mishlê*, or more commonly *mishyet*, *bikyet*, *nisyet*, *ridyet*. In the Targúms the punctuation is *ܫܢܝܬ*, *ܫܢܝܬ*, but this I consider doubtful. But the transitives undergo contraction: *galáwat* or *galáyat* becomes in Aramaic *galút*, which appears in

Biblical Aramaic as **מָטַת**, **הוֹת**, **רַבַּת**, **עָדַת**; the form with *pathach*, though equally common, seems to be less correct, e.g. **הוֹת**, **מַחַת**, **מָטַת**, **עָנַת**; in Syr. as **ܡܬܬ**, **ܚܬܬ**; in Mand. as **ܡܬܬ**, **ܚܬܬ** (for **ܚܬܬ**); in the Talmúd as **הוֹת**, **הוֹת**, or more commonly **הוּא**, **הוּא**, **אַתָּא**, where the *ʿ* must be a trace either of the lost radical or of the evanishing final soft *t*, which wholly disappears in Mandaitic before enclitics, as **ܥܡܬܐܠܗ**, "she swore to him." In Arabic the same contraction takes place, but the Arab has a certain dislike to a long vowel in a shut syllable, and has consequently shortened *ât* into *at*, **جَلَّتْ**, **رَمَتْ**, for **جَلَّات**, **رَمَّات**, and these for **جَلَّيْتُ** or **جَلَوْتُ** and **رَمَّيْتُ**. In Hebrew, according to the analogy of **קָטְלָהּ** for **קָטְלָתָהּ**, we should expect the 3rd pers. sing. fem. to be **גָּלְיָהּ** (for **גָּלְיָתָהּ**), and this form is actually once found, with the older accentuation in pause, viz. **הַגָּלְיָהּ**, Ps. lvii. 2. More frequently, however, the Hebrew takes the same course as the Arabic, and contracts the original *galáyat* into *galát*, whence with suffix-pronouns in sundry derived conjugations, **עָנִיתִי**, Ruth iii. 6, **בָּלַתִּי**, Zach. v. 4, **הָטַתִּי**, Prov. vii. 21. But in pause the vowel is slightly lengthened, **עָשָׂתִּי** Job xxxiii. 4, **רָאִיתִּי** Job xlii. 5, **הִיִּתִּי**, Ps. xcix. 50, **כָּסַתִּי** Ps. xlv. 16; and so also in the separate form **עָשָׂתָהּ** Lev. xxv. 21, **הִיִּתָהּ** 2 Kings ix. 37 *kêthîbh*, Siloam inscription l. 3, and from derived conjugations **הִרְצָתָהּ**, Lev. xxvi. 34, **הִלָּאֲתָהּ** (in pause), Ezek. xxiv. 12, **הִגָּלְתָהּ**, Jerem. xiii. 19. Far more frequently, however, the Hebrew uses separately the form **עָשָׂתָהּ**, **רָאִיתָהּ**, in pause **עָשָׂתָהּ**, **רָאִיתָהּ**. Herein there is no great mystery. The language had got accustomed to the form **קָטְלָהּ**, and as the old **עָשָׂתָהּ** (for **עָשִׂיתָהּ**) was no longer perspicuous and intelligible, the usual termination **הָ**

was once more appended to it. We ourselves do much the same thing when we say *thou lovest*, with a double pronominal termination, to distinguish this form externally from *he loves* or *loveth*. It is curious, however, to observe the Mandaite using a similar form when he connects the verb with an enclitic, as הִנֵּאתֵאלֶה, "it pleased him," גִּלֵּאתֵאלֶכֶן, "she revealed to you," אֵתֵאלֶהוֹן, "she came to them." Here הִנֵּאתֵה etc. stand for הִנֵּאתֵה etc., the final *t* having disappeared as in the ordinary נִפְלֵאלֶה or נִפְלֵאלֶה, "she fell," compared with the separate נִפְלֵאת.

On the 3rd pers. dual, which occurs only in Arabic, I will merely remark that the masc. form is uncontracted, نَدَوَا, حَلَوْا رَضِيَا رَمَيَا: whereas the fem. is directly derived from the contracted singular. The form in use is رَمَيْنَا جَلَيْنَا, not, as we should have expected, رَمَيْنَا جَلَيْنَا, though these latter are said to occur dialectically. The ear having once got accustomed to رَمَت, the dual was naturally taken from this form, as was قَتَلْنَا from قَتَلَت.

The 3rd pers. plur. masc. requires a little more explanation. Reverting to the Ethiopic, we find in use the uncontracted ተለሰ: *taláson*, ባከሶ: *bakáyū*, ላብሶ: *‘ábyū*; to which correspond in Hebrew the pausal חָסְיוּ, Deut. xxxii. 37, נָפְטְיוּ, Num. xxiv. 6, הִתְיַי, Is. xxi. 14, Jerem. xii. 9; and so too probably, though out of pause, Ps. lxxiii. 2, נָטְיוּ רָגְלֵי (for נָטְיוּ *kəthībū*), and Prov. xxvi. 7, [where some copies read] הִלְיוּ שָׁקִים מִפֶּסַח (for [the Massoretic] הִלְיוּ הִלְיוּ). More usually, however, contraction takes place in Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic. In Arabic the form varies according to the characteristic vowel: حَلَّوْا becomes رَضَوْا and خَزَيْوْا also become رَضَوْا and

خَزُوا; but a preceding *fāṭha* produces a diphthong, خَزُوا for رَمُوا, رَمُوا for رَمُوا. The vulgar forms in Egypt are *ramû* from *ramā*, but *mishyû* or *mishyû* from *mishî* "go," *bikyû*, *nisyû*, *ridyû*. In Aramaic we may also remark a difference between the intransitive and the transitive forms: ܠܝܢܝܢ makes ܠܝܢܝܢ, shortened into ܠܝܢܝܢ, but ܠܝܢܝܢ makes ܠܝܢܝܢ, contracted, after dropping the final *n*, into ܠܝܢܝܢ *gêlâw* for *gêlâ'û*. The corresponding form in Biblical Aramaic texts is usually read with *ô* for *au*, ܠܝܢܝܢ, ܠܝܢܝܢ, ܠܝܢܝܢ; but also ܠܝܢܝܢ Dan. v. 3, 4. In the later Jewish writings I find such forms as ܠܝܢܝܢ, ܠܝܢܝܢ, and ܠܝܢܝܢ. In Syriac the original *gêlâ'û* is used with suffixes, as ܠܝܢܝܢ or ܠܝܢܝܢ, "they sought me." In our Jewish Aramaic texts the punctuation is exemplified by ܠܝܢܝܢ Dan. v. 6, in later texts ܠܝܢܝܢ, ܠܝܢܝܢ. In Mandaitic the usual form is ܠܝܢܝܢ, ܠܝܢܝܢ, ܠܝܢܝܢ (for ܠܝܢܝܢ), but the *n* is sometimes dropped, ܠܝܢܝܢ, ܠܝܢܝܢ: this latter form is always used with enclitics, ܠܝܢܝܢ, ܠܝܢܝܢ. With suffixes the shorter form is employed, e.g. ܠܝܢܝܢ "saw me," ܠܝܢܝܢ "sought me"; but the fuller form with ' often occurs, as ܠܝܢܝܢ "saw me," ܠܝܢܝܢ. In Hebrew the prevalent form is identical with that of the vulgar Arabic. The normal ܠܝܢܝܢ (for *galayû*) has been contracted into ܠܝܢܝܢ.

The corresponding fem. in Ethiopic is *talâwā*, *bakâyā*, 'ābyā. In Aramaic the yet fuller form with final *n* is preserved, e.g. Chald. ܠܝܢܝܢ, ܠܝܢܝܢ (for ܠܝܢܝܢ); Syr. ܠܝܢܝܢ, ܠܝܢܝܢ; but far more common are the shortened ܠܝܢܝܢ, ܠܝܢܝܢ, ܠܝܢܝܢ. With suffixes, however, the Syriac exhibits the purer forms intact, ܠܝܢܝܢ, ܠܝܢܝܢ. In Mandaitic this form is rare, but Noeldeke gives as examples ܠܝܢܝܢ and ܠܝܢܝܢ, which are probably to be read *elzê* and *eknê* or *k'nê*, for ܠܝܢܝܢ.

and قَتَلَ. The Arabic, as you may remember, has adopted the form قَتَلَ instead of the original *katalàna*; whence in this class of verbs we meet, according to the vowel of the 2nd syllable, with the forms حَلَوْنَ, رَضِينَ, رَمِينَ, نَدَوْنَ. The form رَضِينَ stands for رَضُونَ, and حَلَوْنَ for حَلَوْنَ.

In the 2nd pers. sing. masc. the Ethiopic exhibits the oldest form ተለገገ: *taláwka*, በበይነ: *bakáyka*, በበይነ: *‘abayka*, from ተለገገ: The contracted form too is common in verbs 3rd *w*, as ተለገገ: ሐይነ: , much rarer in those 3rd *y*, as ሐይነ: Verbs 3rd *y*, of which the 2nd radical is a guttural, weaken the diphthong still further into *i*, as ሐይነ: *rē’íka*, ሐይነ: *rē’íka*, from ሐይነ: and ሐይነ: In classical Arabic the forms are precisely what we should expect from analogy: حَلَوْ makes حَلَوْتُ and خَزِي and خَزِيْتُ, but نَلَا and رَمَي make نَلَوْتُ and رَمَيْتُ.

In the modern dialects these words may be pronounced nearly as *t’lót* and *r’mít*, which are weakened in the dialect of N. Africa to *à* and *é*, غَزَوْتُ *gh’ezùt* and *r’mít*. Spitta gives the Egyptian forms as *sakít* and *mishít*. In the Aramaic dialects there is a considerable variety. The Biblical Aramaic of Daniel exhibits חוּיָהּ ii. 41, 43, 45, iv. 17, חוּיָהּ ii. 31, 34, and רִבִּיָּהּ iv. 19 (*kēthībh*, where I do not understand the Massoretic alteration into רִבִּיָּהּ), בְּנִיָּהּ (in some MSS. even בְּנִיָּהּ, with incomprehensible ָ or ִ) Dan. iv. 27, all with soft *i*, which I do not find it easy to explain; in later books we find גְּלִיָּהּ as well as גְּלִיָּהּ, but in the plural the weaker form גְּלִיָּהּ has prevailed, e.g. חוּיָּהּ Dan. ii. 8. Intransitive verbs of the form סָגִי have of course סָגִי, סָגִי. In Syriac only the form סָגִי, סָגִי is used; and from the intransitive סָגִי, סָגִי, סָגִי likewise

with hard *t*, by way of distinction from the 1st pers. **נִבְּרָה**. The Mandaitic appears to have weakened the original vowels most, for though the plural exhibits the diphthong **קראיתון**, **הואיתון**, more frequently than the weaker **קריתון**, **עיתון** (*e* or *i*?), yet in the singular we find only **קרית**, **הוית**, **בית** (for **בעית**). Lastly in Hebrew the weakest form of all has prevailed; **בָּנִיתָם**, **בָּנִיתָ**, stand for *banētha*, *bnēthēm*, and these for *bandyta*, *banaytūm*.

The 1st pers. sing. and plur. deviate but little from the analogy of the 2nd. In Gē'ēz and Arabic the forms, apart from the pronominal affix, are identical; and in the vulgar dialects the forms are *saḵēt*, *saḵēnā*, *mishīt*, *mishīnā*. In Hebrew too **עָשִׂיתִי**, **עָשִׂינוּ**, are the exact counterparts in vocalisation of **עָשִׂיתָ**, standing for '*asdytī*', '*asdyñū*'. The one form **שָׂרַחְתִּי** is remarkable as corresponding exactly with the Arabic **سَلَوْتُ**.

The Aramaic forms we must notice with a little more detail. The book of Daniel and the Targūms offer us **הוֹיִת**, **הוֹיִת**, **רְמִינָא**, **רְמִינָא**, with *ē* for *ai*; the weaker **צְבִית** occurs in Dan. vii. 19; intrans. verbs have naturally the vowel *i*, **סְנִינָא**, **סְנִינָא**. Similarly in Syriac, in the singular, **رَمِيث** (*rēmīth* (eastern) or **رَمِيث** (*rēmīth* (western); but the plural retains the older diphthong **رَمِيث** or **رَمِيث**. Intransitives have always *i*, **نَبِيث**, **نَبِيث** or **نَبِيث**. In Mandaitic the usual form is **קרית**, **הוית**, **בית** (for **בעית**), but whether with *e* or *i* is uncertain. The plural has not only the weaker form **בין**, **אתין**, **הטין**, but also the stronger diphthongal **מטאנין**, **קראנין**, **הטאנין**. Before enclitics the plural exhibits both forms, **קרנאלה**, **הואנאלה**. The singular in the same position has only the weak form, but in two varieties. Firstly, the final **ת** may be rejected, as **הריבה**, **קרילה**; or, secondly, the original termination of the 1st person may be restored, **קריתלה**, **שריתבה**, "I dwelt in it." In the Talmūd

the ordinary form of the 1st pers. sing. has also lost the final *t*, as אָתָא "I came," בָּעֵאִי "I asked," לָךְ קָרָאִי לָךְ תִּנָּאִי "for thee have I read (the Scriptures), for thee have I repeated" (the Mishnah); but the fuller form is found occasionally both in it and in the Targūms, as סָגִיתִי, נָלִיתִי, אָתִיתִי.

Passing on to the *imperfect*, I will first invite your attention to the forms in Gē'ēz of the indic. and subj. In the indic. the original forms must have been *yētālāw*, *yēbakēyu*; but the final short vowels were dropped, yielding *yētālāw*, *yēbakēy*; and the contraction took place, giving as the actual forms in use *yētālā*, *yēbakē*, *yāwā*, *ḥ*, 3 sing. f. *tētālāw*, *tēbakēy*; 3 pl. m. *yētālāw*, *yēbakēy*. In the subj., which corresponds with the ordinary imperf. of the other Semitic languages, the fuller *yētlāw*, *yēbkēy*, were contracted into *yētlā*, *yēbkē*; 3 sing. f. *tētlāw*, *tēbkēy*; 3 pl. m. *yētlāw*, *yēbkēy*. The forms with *a* in the 2nd syllable may be exemplified by *yēftaw*, *yēbay*, which become *yēftau*, *yēbai*; the former may be further vocalised into *yēftō*.

The form of the Arabic imperfect is, as you remember, identical with that of the Ethiopic subjunctive: Ar. *yāktulu* = Eth. *yēktēl*. We therefore obtain in the imperf. indic. the forms *yāt-luwa*, *yābkiyu*, *yārḍayu*. The rejection of the final short vowels reduces these to *yātluw*, *yābkiy*, *yārḍay*, which then become *yātlū*, *yābki*, *yārḍā*. The subjunctive differs from the indic. only in its final vowel *a*, instead of *u*; but as the combinations *uwa* and *iya* do not undergo contraction, the forms in use are *yātluwa* *يَتْلُو* and *yābkiya* *يَبْكِي*; whereas the combination *aya* becomes first *ay* and then *ā*, *yārḍā* *يَرْضِي*, which is therefore indistinguishable from the indic. The corresponding vulgar forms are *yimshē* and *yirḍā*. The 3rd Arabic form, the jussive, is marked in the regular verb by the absence of any final vowel, *يَقْتُلْ*. Hence in verbs 3rd *و* and *ي* the original form must have been *yētlū*, *yēbki*, *yēṣi*, which would necessarily become *yātlū*, *yābki*, *yārḍā*, and thus coincide with the indicative. To obviate

this, the language shortened the final vowels, and the result was the forms *yátlū* ^{يَتَلُّوْا}, *yábki* ^{يَبْكِي}, *yarda* ^{يَرْضَى}.

These Arabic forms in their turn cast much light on the corresponding ones in Hebrew. If we regard the word *יָגֵלָה* by itself, we might readily suppose that the final vowel *ē* was merely a dulling or obscuration of an older *û*; that *yiglē* stood for *yiglû*, just as *פָּה* ^{pe} stands for *pû*, Ar. *فُو*, or *זֶה* ^{zē} for *zû*, Ar. *ذُو*. Were this the case, *יָגֵלָה* would correspond letter for letter to the Ar. *yaglû*, ^{يَاجِلُوْا}. Other circumstances, however, militate against this explanation. For instance, if *יָגֵלָה* = ^{يَاجِلُوْا}, then the 3rd pl. fem. ought to be *תִּגְלוּנָה* = ^{يَاجِلُوْنَ} for *yagluwana*, whereas the form in use is *תִּגְלוּנָהּ*. And how about *יִבְכֶּה* = ^{يَبْكِي}, and

יַחְיֶה = ^{يَاخِي} *yahyâ*? It would seem therefore that in verbs of this class the vowel *a* gained the upper hand in Hebrew as the characteristic vowel of the 2nd syllable; and final *ω* everywhere gave place to *y*; so that the oldest Hebrew forms were *yaglay*, *yabkay*, most nearly resembling the Arabic *yardû* ^{يَرْضِي} for *yarday*, for the *alif maḥṣūra* of the Arabic is represented in Hebrew by the termination *הָ*. In the jussive this vowel would naturally be shortened to the utmost, whence such words are *יִרָא*, *יִבְכֶּה*, *יִחַד*. In course of time, however, as the final letter became absolutely vowelless, a difficulty would be experienced in the utterance of the two consecutive consonants. Words like *יִרָא*, *יִשַׁע*, *יִחַד*, *יִבְנֶה*, *יִגַּל*, *יַעֲשֶׂה*, were unpronounceable by the Hebrew organs, and a supplementary or furtive vowel had to be introduced to facilitate their utterance. Hence such forms as *יִרְאֵה*, *יִשַׁעֵה*, *יִחַדֵה*, *יִבְנֶה*, *יִגַּלֵה*, *יַעֲשֶׂה*. In *יִרָא*, *יִשַׁע*, *יִחַד* (with hard *ד*), *יִבְנֶה*, *יִגַּל*, *יַעֲשֶׂה*. In *יִרָא*, *יִשַׁע*, *יִחַד*, the jussives *יִרְאֵה* and *יִחַדֵה* became *יִרְאֵה* and *יִחַדֵה*.

just like the similar nominal forms עֲנִי, בָּכִי, for עָנִי, בָּכִי. A trace of the original *a* of the first syllable remains, both in verb and noun, in the pausal forms יָחִי, יָחִי, בָּכִי, for the original יָחִי, יָחִי, בָּכִי.

In Aramaic the same form is dominant as in Hebrew, the imperfect being usually of the forms יִבְנֶה or יִבְנֶא, נִבְנָא, Mand. נִקְרִיא. Very remarkable is לְהוּא or לְהוּה in Ezra and Daniel, with the plur. masc. לְהוּן and fem. לְהוּיָן. The verb סָסַן has also in Syriac a shorter form סָסַן for the common נִסְסֹן, and in Mand. Noeldeke gives נִהוּא or לִהוּא as well as נִהוּיא or לִהוּיא. Similar varieties occur in Samaritan, יְהִי, and in Talmudic, לִהוּי and נִהִי. In Syriac too the verb سَبَّأ, "to live," contracts its imperf. into نَبَّأ or بَنَّأ (for نَسَبَّأ), but in Mand. this does not seem to be the case (نِهَيَّأ).

The contractions which the augmented persons of the imperfect undergo, I will illustrate by the 2nd pers. sing. fem. and the 3rd pers. plural.

In Ethiopic no contraction takes place: the 2nd pers. sing. fem. is *tətaləwī*, *təbakéyi*; *tətləwī*, *təbkéyi*, *təftáwī*; the 3rd pers. plur. masc. *yətaləwū*, f. -*awā*, *yəbakéyū* -*yā*; *yətləwū* -*awā*, *yəbkéyū* -*yā*, *yəbáyū* -*yā*.

In the other dialects these forms are more or less contracted.

In Arabic the 2nd pers. sing. fem. is, for example, تَجْلِيْنَ from رَعِيْ. In the former case, تَجْلِيْنَ stands for *tagluzūna*: in the latter, تَرْمِيْنَ stands for *tarmiyūna*. A verb like رَضِيَ gives the form تَرْضِيْنَ, for *tardayūna*. The vulgar forms are *timshī*, *tirdī*. The corresponding Hebrew forms are תַּעֲשֶׂינָּה, תַּעֲשִׂי, תַּהְיִי, תַּהְיֶה, תִּבְכִּי, תִּבְכֶּי, תִּבְכֵּי. Here תַּעֲשֶׂינָּה stands for

ta'sayn, *tibki* for *tabkayl*, etc. The Syriac has the advantage over the Hebrew in having the vowel *i* instead of the weaker *é*, *ܬܒܟܝ* for *tabkayn*.

The 3rd pers. plur. masc. in Arabic has the forms *يَجْلُونَ*, *يَجْلُون*. The first of these is contracted from *yagluwûna*, the second from *yarmiynûna*, the third from *yardayûna*. The vulgar forms are *yimshû*, *yirdû*. The corresponding Hebrew form occurs not unfrequently in its uncontracted shape, *יִשְׁתּוּ*, *יִשְׁרּוּ*; without final *u*, *יִשְׁתּוּ*, *יִשְׁרּוּ*; with a weaker vowel in the 2nd syllable, *יִשְׁתּוּ* Deut. viii. 13, *יִשְׁרּוּ* Ps. xxxvi. 9. These stand for *yabkayûna*, *yarbayûna*, etc. More frequently, however, a still further change takes place: *יִשְׁתּוּ* becomes *יִשְׁתּוּ*. Hence *יִשְׁתּוּ*, *יִשְׁרּוּ*, *יִשְׁתּוּ*, *יִשְׁרּוּ*. In Syriac the masc. form is *ܢܝܪܡܝܢ* *něrmôn*, according to the Eastern pronunciation, for *narmayîn*; the Westerns weaken the vowel of the 2nd syllable to *û*, *něrmûn*, *ܢܝܪܡܝܢ*. The corresponding Mand. form is written *ܢܝܪܡܝܢ*, *ܢܝܪܡܝܢ*: with an enclitic, *ܢܝܪܡܝܢܐ*; and in Biblical Chaldee we also find *ܢܝܪܡܝܢ*, *ܢܝܪܡܝܢ*.

The 3rd pers. plur. fem. in Arabic is *يَرْضَيْنَ*, *يَجْلُون*; the first of which, according to the norm *يَجْلُون*, stands for *yag-lucena*, the second for *yarmiyna*, the third for *yardayna*. The corresponding Hebrew form is *תַּבְּכִינָה*, *תַּחֲוִינָה*, *תַּעֲשִׂינָה*, for *ta'sayna*, *taḥzayna*, *tabkayna*. The Aramaic preserves here an older shape than the other dialects, and does not contract. In Jewish Aramaic we have *ܠܗܝܢ*, *ܝܢܝܢ* Dan. v. 16; in Syriac *ܢܝܪܡܝܢܐ*; in Mand. *ܢܝܪܡܝܢܐ* or *ܢܝܪܡܝܢܐ*, corresponding very closely to the Ethiopic subjunctive *yəbkēyā*, for *yəbkēyān*.

Passing on to the imperative, we find the minimum of contraction in the Ethiopic where the masc. sing. is *tēlū* (for *tēlāw*),

f. *tēlēwē*, pl. m. *tēlēwē*; *bēki* (for *bēkēy*), f. *bēkēyē*, pl. m. *bēkēyū*; *‘ēbai* (for *‘ēbay*), f. *‘ēbayē*, pl. m. *‘ēbayū*; *fētaw* or *fētō* (for *fētaw*), f. *fētawē*, pl. m. *fētawē*. In Arabic the 3rd radical has altogether

disappeared, as in the jussive, and only a vowel remains: *أَجَلْ* *uglu* for *ugluzw*, *أَرْمِ* *irmi* for *irmiy*, *أَرْضْ* *irḍa* for *irḍay* or *irḍā*.

The vulgar forms have the long vowels, *imshī*, *irḍā*. The different persons undergo contraction precisely as in the imperfect.

For instance the feminines of the above words are *أَجَلِي* *uglī* for *ugluzwē*, *أَرْمِي* *irmī* for *irmiyē*, and *أَرْضِي* *irḍay* for *irḍayē*; their

plurals masc., *أَجَلُوا* *uglū* for *ugluzwē*, *أَرْمُوا* *irmū* for *irmiyū*, and *أَرْضُوا* *irḍaw* for *irḍayū*. The vulgar forms are: fem. *imshī*, *irḍī*;

plur. *imshū*, *irḍū*. In Hebrew the termination of the imperat. sing. masc. is substantially the same as that of the imperfect, but

with a slight lengthening of the vowel, *גִּלֵּה*, *רֵאֵה*, *עֲלֵה*, *הִיֵּה*, for *gēlai*, etc. This lengthening is sometimes found in the imperfect, especially in pause and with a jussive sense; as *יֵרֵא*

Gen. xli. 33, *יַעֲשֶׂה* Is. lxiv. 3, *אֶל-תַּהֲיֶה* Jerem. xvii. 17. The

sing. fem. is *גִּלִּי*, *עֲשִׂי*, *רֵאִי*, for *gil'yē*, and that for *gēlayē*. The

plur. masc. is found in the oldest form *kēṭālū* in such words as

קִיּוּ and *בָּעִי*; but far more common are words like *קִיּוּ*, *עֲשׂוּ*,

רֵאוּ, *בִּנּוּ*, for *bikl'yū*, etc. The corresponding fem. is exemplified

by *רֵאִינָה*, Cant. iii. 11, for *rē'ayna*, in Arabic *رَيْنَ* *raina*. In

Syriac we find a very few imperatives with the original diphthong in the 2nd syllable, e.g. *بُحَّبْ*, *بُحَّبْ*, *بُحَّبْ*; and in the

Targūms the punctuation with *i* occurs, *גִּלִּי*; but generally

speaking, in Aramaic the sound of *i* prevails. So in Dan. ii. 4,

חִי; in Syr. *ܚܝܬܐ*, *ܚܝܬܐ*, *ܚܝܬܐ*; in Mand. *קריא*, *הויא*. The

fem. and plurals retain more of the ancient forms than in Hebrew.

Thus the fem. sing. in Syriac is **זַמְּלִי**; in Mand. **קראי, הואי**, and in the Talmūd **חראי** "rejoice," **גבאי** "get thyself paid." Hence it appears that the fem. form **גלי** in the Targūms is to be read **גִּלִּי** (and not **גָּלִי**, as indeed we might infer from the variant **גִּלִּי** (for **גִּלִּי**). The plural masc. in Syriac is **זַמְּלוּ**, for *rēmā'ū*, and that for *rēmā'ūn* **זַמְּלוּן**. The Mand. exhibits the contraction **הוון, הרון**; the Bibl. Aram. the still greater one of **הוּו, אַתוּו**. The corresponding fem. in Syriac is **זַמְּלִינִי** *rēmā'yēn*, for *rēmā-jān*, to which answer the Jewish Aram. **רָמַן** or **רָמַנָּה**, and the Mand. **אתיאן**, in Syr. **زمتي**.

With regard to the infinitive I will merely remark that the Hebrew form **גלה, בנה, היו, עשו**, has lost its 3rd radical. Originally these were words of same form as the Arabic infinitive **بَكَأَ, بَنَآ, خَفَا**, where the 3rd rad. **و** or **ي** appears as a *hamza*. In Hebrew however the *hamza* fell away after the loss of the final vowels, and the preceding *ā* passed as usual into *ô*. The other infinitive **גלות, בנות, עשות**, stands for *galāth, banāth*, by contraction for *galawāt, banayāt*; just as in Arabic **صَلَاة** stands for **صَلَوَةٌ, حَيَاة** for **حَيَوَةٌ, فِتَاة** for **فَتِيَّة**. The Aramaic infinitive with prefixed *m* varies slightly in form in the several dialects. In Bibl. Aramaic we have **מְבִנָּה, מְבִנָּה, מְבִנָּה**, with suff. **מְבִנָּה**, as contrasted with the Syriac **مَبْنِي, مَبْنِي**, with suff. **مَبْنِي**. In the form **مَبْنِي** I see the influence of verbs **ל'א**, as well as in the imperatives of Pa'ēl, Aph'ēl, etc. In Mand. both forms seem to occur, **מִבְנִיָּה, מִבְנִיָּה**, as well as **מִבְנִיָּה**; and so also in the Talmūd **מִבְנִיָּה, מִבְנִיָּה**, as well as **מִבְנִיָּה** "to get paid." There also occurs in Bibl. Aram. the form **לְמִבְנִיָּה** Ezra v. 9, like **מִבְנִיָּה** in Targ. Prov. xxv. 27 and

מִשְׁתַּיָּא in Targ. Esther v. 14. The form לְבַנָּא or לְבַנָּא in Ezra v. 3, 13, is probably corrupt; in any case it must be meant for an infin. Pe'al and not Hithpe'el.

The Arabic participle active has the same form as in the regular verb, but contracted: رَامِي, جَالِي, for رَامٍ, جَالٍ. رَامِي, fem. جَالِيَّة, etc. The vulgar form is *bākī, māshī, rādī*, fem. *bākīye* or *bākīe* (with short *a*), etc. The Aramaic has preserved an older form *kātal*, instead of the prevalent *kātīl*; e.g. in Biblical Aramaic עֲנָה, שָׁתָה, plur. שָׁתִין, בָּנִין, fem. רָמְיָה, plur. שָׁנִין; in Syriac ܪܡܝܬܐ, ܢܝܬܐ, fem. ܪܡܝܬܐ, ܢܝܬܐ; and in Mandaitic ܪܡܝܬܐ, ܢܝܬܐ. The form ܢܝܬܐ, for *bānayīn*, is analogous to the Hebrew plurals שָׁמַיִם, מַיִם, for *mayīm* and *shamayīm*, and is probably due to an effort to preserve the consonant power of the *yōd* unimpaired. Similar to the Aramaic is the Hebrew form, which appears in its integrity in the proper name חֲוִי; but ordinarily *ai* has passed into *ē*, and we get the form חֲוֶה, רֲעֶה, construct חוֹה, רֹעֶה, like שָׂרָה, שָׂרָה, שָׂרִי. The corresponding fem. is exemplified by זֶנֶה, רֲעֶה, פָּרָה, which stand for *pārayat, rā'ayat, sānayāt*. The fem. עֲמִיָּה, Cant. i. 7, is like the Aramaic רָמְיָה, or it may rather be taken as = Arabic جَالِيَّة, with *i* in the 2nd syllable; if so, the other form ܦܪܝܬܐ, ܪܥܝܬܐ, ܦܢܝܬܐ, is only a slight variation, with emphatic utterance of the 3rd radical.

The passive participle of the Hebrew presents the regular form *kāṭīl*, בָּנוּי, עָשׂוּי, fem. בְּנוּיָה, עֲשׂוּיָה, with *y* at the end, whether the third radical be really *y* or *n*. The final radical is sometimes rejected, ܦܢܝܐ, ܪܥܝܐ, which some derive from עָשׂוּי, ܦܢܝܐ, others from עָשׂוּי, ܦܢܝܐ. The original *w* reappears in the two plurals ܦܢܝܐ, ܪܥܝܐ, 1 Sam. xxv. 18, and ܢܡܝܐ, Is. iii. 16.

In Esther ii. 9 ^{הָרְאִיּוֹת} seems to be a mistake for ^{הָרְאִיּוֹת}, which is found in some MSS. and editions. The corresponding Aramaic participle has the form ^{בְּנָה}, ^{חָיָה}, ^{מָנָה}; Syr. ^{ܩܝܬܐ}; Mand. ^{ܩܝܬܐ}; the plur. is ^{ܩܝܬܐܢ} Dan. iii. 25, in Syr. ^{ܩܝܬܐܢ}; the fem. ^{ܩܝܬܐܢܐ}. The form would seem then to be that of adjectives like ^{ܡܠܐ}, ^{ܡܠܐ}; ^{ܡܠܐ} (or ^{ܡܠܐ}), ^{ܡܠܐ}; which spring from an original *katal* or *katil*, like ^{ܒܬܠܐ} "brave," ^{ܚܫܢܐ} "handsome," ^{ܕܢܝܐ} "glad," ^{ܕܢܝܐ} "dirty." The nearest Arabic equivalent would be ^{ܫܝܥܐ} "in grief," ^{ܪܕܐ} "perishing," for ^{ܫܝܥܐ}, ^{ܪܕܐ}, but either the Aramaic words had *a* in the second syllable, or the termination was influenced by that of the active participle. On this supposition ^{ܒܢܐ} would stand for *banay*, plur. ^{ܒܢܐܝܢ} for *banayîn*, fem. ^{ܒܢܐܝܬܐ} for *banaya*, *banayat*. Lastly, the Arabic passive participle has the form *makṭūl*, and therefore appears in these verbs as ^{ܡܪܝܝܐ}, ^{ܡܪܝܝܐ}, ^{ܡܪܝܝܐ}. In the case of ^{ܡܪܝܝܐ}, the influence of the final *y* has sufficed to transform the original *ū* of ^{ܡܪܝܝܐ}, ^{ܡܪܝܝܐ}, into *ī*. The vulgar forms may be exemplified by ^{ܡܪܝܝܐ}, ^{ܡܪܝܝܐ}, which has become *māhdi*, fem. *mahdiye*, plur. *mahdiyîn*.

In treating of the derived conjugations I can be somewhat more brief¹.

In the intensive or Pi^{“ēl} the Ethiopic form alone is pure in the third person of the perfect: ^{ሐለዉ} *hallāwa*, "watch,"

¹ [Of the sketch of the derived conjugations of these verbs there is, among Prof. Wright's papers, only a rough draft in pencil, not going beyond the intensive or Pi^{“ēl}. There are indications in the MS. that the writer intended to add, in a separate paragraph, some remarks on the other derived conjugations; but, as these are for the most part constructed on exactly the same model as the Pi^{“ēl}, it has seemed sufficient to refer to them from time to time, in the course of the discussion of the intensive, by foot-notes or insertions within square brackets.]

חֲלַל: *hallāya*, "meditate," חָלַל: *hassāwa*, "lie," שָׁנַן: *sannāya*, "be beautiful," חָלַל: *hallāwa* "become, be," contracted חָלַל *hallō*¹. The Arabic exhibits ي for و in the 3rd pers. sing., not only here, but throughout all the derived conjugations; جَلَّى for *gallaya*, whence plur. masc. جَلَّوْا for *gallayū*, fem. جَلَّيْنَ. The vulgar form of the plur. masc. would be *gallū*. In Hebrew we find similar forms prevailing, viz. גָּלָה for *gallaya*, גָּלוּ for *gallayū* [Niph'al גָּלָה plur. גָּלוּ, and so forth]. In Aramaic the vowel of the first syllable has been retained intact, but that of the second has been weakened to the utmost, the resulting form being in Bibl. Aram. רַבִּי, מַנִּי [Haph'el רַבִּי, מַנִּי from אֲתָה, etc.], Syr. رُبِّ, مَنِّ, Mand. שאניא, אסיא for *mannaya*, etc., [and so throughout the other derived conjugations]. The lengthening of the final vowel by the complete vocalisation of the radical *y* has affected the form of the 3rd plur. masc., which is now שָׁנּוּ, שָׁרּוּ; Syr. سَنَّه, سَرَّه; the Mand. however gives us שָׁנּוּן, שָׁרּוּן for *shannayūna*. Of the 3rd plur. fem. there are no examples in Biblical Aramaic. The Syriac form is رُبِّ, shortened from رُبِّ from an original *rabbayān(a)*; Mand. [Aph'el] אסיא, אוריבון = אֲסִיב חֲסִיב.—The 3rd sing. fem. of the Arabic is جَلَّتْ for *gallayat*, which appears in Hebrew (before suffixes) as *gillath*, e.g. כָּלַתוּ, צִוִּיתָהּ, or, with slight tone-lengthening of the vowel כָּלַתִּי, כָּלַתִּי. The ordinary form in Hebrew of course is כָּלַתָּה, כָּלַתָּה, with double termination. The Aramaic inflects regularly, رُبِّ for *rabbayat*, Mand. שאריאת, שאניאת. The Targūms give, it is true, the forms גָּלִית, גָּלִית, but this punctuation seems as doubtful as

¹ [And so in the other derived conjugations *ātlawa*, *āstaya*, *tafātwa*, *tahīrya*, etc.; so that the whole inflexion of the perfects is the same as in the strong verb.]

in the 1st conjugation. The 2nd pers. always retains the diphthong in Arabic, جَلَيْتَ *gallaita* for *gallayta*, of which the vulgar form would be *gillit*. In Hebrew the vowel is weakened to *ē*, צוֹיֵת, בָּסִיֵת, fem. גָּלִית, plur. masc. עוֹיֵתם, בָּלִיתם, but the older *ē* is sometimes retained in the first pers., e.g. נָקִיִּי, קָנִיִּי, גָּלִיִּי and גָּלִיִּי, צוֹיִי and צוֹיִי¹. In Biblical Aramaic the only form that occurs is מְנִית, Dan. iii. 12. Syriac distinguishes the second person ذُضِلَ (plur. ذُضِلُوا) by giving it hard *t*, while the first person is ذُضِلَ with soft *t*². The former word was originally *rabbaita*, the latter *rabbaiti*, and so the reason for the different treatment of the two cases lies merely in the wish to differentiate the later forms. Whether the same rule applies to the Mand. מְנִית, שְׁאֲנִית, זְאֲנִית, we cannot tell; probably not, as the Targūms seem to make the difference in the vowels, גָּלִית fem. גָּלִית, but גָּלִיִּי, גָּלִיִּי, supposing the punctuation to be correct³.

In Ethiopic the form of the subjunctive mood of the imperfect is ይፈላ፡ *yəḥallū*, ይላሉ፡ *yahallū*, ይፈላ፡ *yəḥallī*, ይላሉ፡ *yahallī* for *-nčw*, *-lčy*. The corresponding indicative, 3rd pers. sing., in Arabic is يَجْلِي by regular contraction for يَجْلِي,

¹ [In the other derived conjugations the older *ē* occurs also in the second person. In the Niph'al it is commoner than *ē*, and in the perfects of Po'el and Hoph'al *ē* is never thinned to *ē* before consonantal affixes.]

² [So in all the derived conjugations, as in the intransitive form of Pe'al; *supra*, p. 261 sq.]

³ [This distinction is not uniformly carried out in the printed texts: e.g., in the first person, the Bomberg editions have צָלִיִּי Ps. xxx. 3 (Nebiensis אֲחִיִּי, צָלִיִּי Deut. xxxiv. 4 (where the same pronunciation is indicated by means of the Babylonian vowels in the MS. of the Brit. Mus. used by Merx, *Chrest. Targ.* p. 54), side by side with אֲחִיִּי Gen. xxxi. 39, Deut. xxvi. 10 (where the edition of Sabbioneta, according to Berliner, has אֲחִיִּי, but Compl. agrees with Bomb.), אֲחִיִּי Ezek. xvi. 3. These examples shew how precarious are the rules formulated in ordinary "Chaldee" grammars, which for the most part are not even based on the fundamental editions of the Targūms.]

according to the norm יִתְּנָל, the preceding *kesr* changing every *a* into *y*. We are therefore surprised to find in Hebrew יִגְלָה instead of יִגְלִי. I can only explain this by supposing that it is due to an effort at uniformity. We found reason to suppose that the *a*-form prevailed in the first conjugation; and it is in its proper place in the passives: יִגְלָה for *yagullay*, Ar. יִתְּגַלִּי; יִגְלָה for *yahuglay*, Ar. יִתְּגַלִּי; whence, I imagine, it spread to the *Pi'el*, [*Hiph'il*], and *Niphal*, giving יִגְלָה instead of יִגְלִי, Ar. יִתְּגַלִּי, and יִגְלָה instead of יִגְלִי, Ar. יִתְּגַלִּי. As regards the plural of the imperfect we find in Hebrew examples of uncontracted forms, תִּדְרִימוּן, Is. xl. 18, תִּדְרִימוּנִי, *ibid.* ver. 25, ch. xlv. 5, יִבְסִימוּ, *Exod.* xv. 5; but the ordinary form is יִגְלוּ, Arabic يَغْلُونَ, *yugallūna*, for *yugalliyūna*. A similarly uncontracted participle is the Pu'al כְּמַהִים in *Isa.* xxv. 6. The shortened or jussive form of the Imperfect is in Arabic يَجَلِّ, to which correspond closely the Hebrew יִצּוּ, *Deut.* xxviii. 8, וַיִּצּוּ, *Ps.* cxli. 8².

The Aramaic form of the Imperfect differs from the Hebrew,

¹ [In like manner יִתְּגַלִּי corresponds to יִתְּגַלִּי.]

² [Similarly in the *Hiph'il* the forms without a helping vowel יִפְתָּ, וַיִּשָּׂא, וַיִּרָא correspond to the Arabic يَجَلِّ, while the forms with a helping vowel like יִגְלֵל, יִגְלֵל stand for *yagl*, *ya'l*, as, in the case of nouns, מָלַךְ, נָעַר stand for *malk*, *na'r*. In the *Hithpa'el* the Jussive is וַיִּתְּגַלֵּל for *yithgall*, pl. וַיִּתְּגַלְּלוּ, in pause וַיִּתְּגַלְּלוּ, 2 Sam. xiii. 6, and so without pause וַיִּתְּגַלְּלוּ, *Deut.* ii. 9, 19 (under the influence of the virtually doubled guttural), also וַיִּתְּגַלְּלוּ. The *Pi'el* הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה has Jussive יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה for יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה.]

being in Biblical Aramaic **יִמְחָא**, **יְבַלֵּא**, often written with י in the Targūms: [and this *ṣērē* runs through all the conjugations], while *seghol* appears in the termination only a very few times in pause, as **אֲחִיָּה**, Dan. ii. 24, **נְחִיָּה**, Dan. ii. 4,—a doubtful punctuation. The plural is **יְבַעֲוִן**, **יְשַׁנּוּן**. The Syriac and Mandaitic forms are nearly identical, viz. **ܢܝܫܝܢ**, pl. **ܢܝܫܝܢܝܐ**, **ܢܝܫܝܢܝܐ**, pl. **ܢܝܫܝܢܝܐ**. In Biblical Aramaic the final *ṣērē* is however shortened with suffixes into *z*, **יְחֻנְנִי**, Dan. v. 7, and **יְחֻנְנִה**, Dan. ii. 11, which might raise a doubt whether **אֲ**, **יֲ** arises out of *ai*, as in Hebrew, or out of *i*. I prefer the former view because of the plural **יְשַׁנּוּן**, and because the participle is **מַצְלֵא**, Dan. vi. 11, with the plural **מַצְלֵי**, Ezra vi. 10, Syr. **ܡܥܠܝܐ**, **ܡܥܠܝܐ**, which could only arise out of *mēṣallayîn* not *mēṣalliyîn*. The striving after unity of termination in the same part of the different verbal forms has here been pushed to its utmost.

The Imperative has in Ethiopic the form **ፈላ**: *fánnâ*, **ፈላ**: *ṣállî* for *fannāw*, *ṣállîy*: fem. **ፈላዊ**: *fannāwî*, **ፈላዊ**: *ṣállîyî*: plur. masc. **ፈላው**: *fannāwâ*, **ፈላው**: *ṣállâyâ*. In Arabic the corresponding form has a short vowel in the singular, **جَلِّ** for *galliy*, but the feminine is **جَلِّى** for *galliyât*, and the plural masc. **جَلُّوا** for *galliyât*. Identical herewith is the shorter Hebrew form **צו**, **מן**, Ps. lxi. 8, **גל**, Ps. cxix. 18, 22, **נס**, Dan. i. 12, for *ṣauwî* etc. The longer and commoner form **צוה**, **קוה**, has arisen under the combined influence of the Qal **גלה** and the normal **קטל**.—In the Aramaic dialects similar forms prevail. The Bibl. Aram. yields the form **מְנִי** for **מְנִי**, Ezr. vii. 25. In the Targūms you will find both **גְּלִי** and **גְּלִי**, but the former is probably correct. So in Mand. **ܙܐܚܝܐ**, **ܙܐܚܝܐ**: in the Talmūd **שני** "change,"

“remove,” in Samaritan מלי, in modern Syriac ܡܠܝܐ, *sāpī* for *sappī*. In ancient Syriac alone do we encounter a different form ܡܠܝܐ, which is probably owing to the influence of verbs ܡܠܝܐ, which would naturally have this vowel¹. The fem. in Syriac is ܡܠܝܐ, in the Targūms ܡܠܝܐ for ܡܠܝܐ; the plur. m. in Syriac is ܡܠܝܐ, in the Targūms ܡܠܝܐ, Mand. ܡܠܝܐ, ܡܠܝܐ; the plur. fem. in Syriac ܡܠܝܐ for *gallâyân*, in the Targūms ܡܠܝܐ.

The Infinitive is remarkable for the variety of its forms. In Arabic the preference is given to the form تَقْلَّة, the real origin of which I explained to you before [*supra*, p. 204]; thus تَعْرِیة, تَسْلِیة, which become in vulgar Arabic, under the influence of the accent, *taslīye*, *taʿzīye*, *tarbīye*. In Hebrew the usual form of the inf. abs. is כָּנָה, כָּנָה, according to the norm קָטַל [and similarly Hiph. הִנָּיָה, Hoph. הִנָּיָה on the norm הִקָּטַל, הִקָּטַל]. but כָּנָה occurs in Ps. xl. 2, which was originally

¹ [As in the infinitive Pe'al ܡܠܝܐ; see p. 268, *supra*. An original *gallay* (with *a* in the last syllable, according to the principle of effort after uniformity of termination explained in the text) would give *gallê*, *gallî*, but an original *malla* (from ܡܠܝܐ - ܡܠܝܐ) might naturally become *mallâ*. Now, in Syriac, verbs ܡܠܝܐ (with a very few exceptions in the intensive stem, such as ܡܠܝܐ and ܡܠܝܐ) have become entirely fused with verbs ܡܠܝܐ and ܡܠܝܐ, and in the main it is the latter class of verbs that have prevailed to determine the form of the verbal inflexions. But in the inf. Pe'al and also in the imperatives Pa'el, Aph'el and Ethpa'al (ܡܠܝܐ, ܡܠܝܐ, ܡܠܝܐ) the ܡܠܝܐ form may be supposed to have prevailed. The imperative Ethpe'al on the other hand has the unweakened termination *ay* ܡܠܝܐ, in Eastern Syriac ܡܠܝܐ *ethgal*, with transposition of the vowel and double silent ܡ. Duval, p. 193, thinks that the imperatives in *â*, to which must be added a single Pe'al form, ܡܠܝܐ “come,” are relics of the energetic form in *an*, *ā*; cf. p. 195 *supra*.]

kanawêl, corresponding to the Arabic form (with weakened vowel) *kittâl*. The inf. const. is גָּלוּת, חִיּוּת, בָּלוּת, formed as an intensive from the *Kal* גָּלוּת etc.; originally therefore *gallâth*. In Aramaic the different dialects vary considerably. The Targūms have גָּלָאָה [with suf. גָּלִיתָ: Aph'el in Biblical Aramaic הִשְׁנִיָּה, תַּחֲנוּנָה, Targumic אֲנִלָּאָה and so forth], the Talmūd Bahl אֲסוּיָּי, צָלוּיָּי, Mand. נאסוּיָּי, אסוּיָּי, which form sometimes occurs in the later Targūms, e.g. רָצוּיָּי. In these dialects forms with prefixed *m* sometimes occur, e.g. Mand. מִישָׁאנוּיָּי; and the same prefix appears in the Syriac forms مَکְشֵׁ constr. مَکְشֵׁ, [Aph'el مَکְشֵׁ and so forth, which, apart from the initial *m*, are of the same type as the Biblical and Targumic forms].

The active participle is in Arabic مُجَلِّلٌ for *mugalliy^m*, the passive مُجَلَّلٌ for *mugallay^m*. Here all is clear and distinct, as also in Hebrew מְגַלֵּה, מְגֻלָּה. But in Aramaic a considerable amount of confusion has been introduced by the unlucky assimilation of active and passive forms. Thus the absolute singular masc. מְגַלֵּי, מְגֻלֵּי, מְגַלֵּי is, it is true, sufficiently distinct from the passive מְגֻלֵּי, מְגֻלֵּי, but all the other forms are hopelessly confounded, and can only be distinguished with the help of the context. [Similarly in the causative stem the Arabic active part. مُجَلِّلٌ and the passive مُجَلَّلٌ, the Hebrew active מְגַלֵּה and the passive מְגֻלָּה are clearly distinguished, but in Syriac the active مְגַלֵּי and the passive مְגֻלֵּי assume identical forms with inflexional additions, مְגַלֵּי, مְגֻלֵּי etc.]

[*Appendix. Verbs of which one radical is an Ḥ.*

Here we must distinguish, in general, between forms in which the **Ḥ** retains its original force as a guttural consonant (*hamza*) and forms in which the **Ḥ** is weakened or disappears, according to the principles laid down above, pp. 44 *sqq.* In the former case there is no irregularity, properly so called, though the **Ḥ** exerts the usual influence of a guttural on neighbouring vowels; in the latter case weak forms arise, some of which can be at once explained by the general rules at pp. 44 *sqq.*, while others involve also the operation of the law of analogy, and the influence of weak verbs of the class that have a **ʔ** or **ʕ** among their radicals.

In Ethiopic verbs a radical **Ḥ** is throughout treated as a guttural. Similarly in Arabic verbs a radical *hamza* commonly remains consonantal in all positions (except where two *hamzas* come together in the same syllable) and the inflexion is essentially regular, though a certain tendency to soften the guttural pronunciation in the direction of **و** or **ي**, under the influence of an *u* or *i* immediately preceding or following the *hamza*, is indicated by the orthographic rules which bid us write ^{هـ}باس for ^{هـ}باس,

^{هـ}يؤثر for ^{هـ}يؤثر, ^{هـ}يؤثر for ^{هـ}يؤثر, ^{هـ}يؤثر for ^{هـ}يؤثر etc. For the details of these rules it is sufficient to refer to the Arabic Grammar. Further weakenings of a radical *hamza*, involving the entire disappearance of the consonant or its conversion into *w* or *y*, occur in old Arabic in certain parts of very common verbs, or, sporadically, under the influence of metrical necessity. It is recorded that in the time of Moḥammed the people of the Ḥijāz retained the guttural force of *hamza* less firmly than many other tribes, and to the influence of the Ḥijāzī pronunciation may be ascribed such readings in the Kor'an as ^{هـ}يأتي, ^{هـ}مؤمن for *ya'tī*, *mu'min*¹. In modern Arabic the

¹ In all cases where radical **ʔ** is represented by ^{هـ}و, ^{هـ}ي or simple ^{هـ} the consonants, taken by themselves, indicate a pronunciation in which the radical has ceased to be heard as a guttural; and this is very intelligible if we remember that the laws of Arabic orthography are mainly based on the text of the Kor'an, which was first written down in the Ḥijāz, and without ^{هـ} or other diacritical points. But as regards

Hebrew forms as **יֹאמֶר**, **תֹּאמַר**, **יֹאכֵר** closely correspond. But in Heb., where the א retains its guttural force, the pronunciation is usually facilitated by the insertion of a *hateph* or a short vowel, **יֹאכֶף**, **יֹאדֶב**, 2 fem. **תֹּאסֶפִי** etc. By this means the radical א may remain consonantal even in the first person, **אֹאכֶף**, whereas in

Arabic **أَكَل** necessarily becomes **أَكَلُ** *ākulu*, because two hamzas cannot be pronounced in one syllable. The same contraction sometimes appears in old Arabic in the other persons, and in modern Arabic the pronunciation *yākul*, *yāmur* is the rule. Similarly Hebrew **אָכַל**, **אָמַר**, **אָפַה** form the imperfects **יֹאכֵל**, **יֹאמַר**, **יֹאפֶה** etc.; *yô-* standing as usual for *yâ-*. The first persons are written **אֹכֵל** etc. with a single א, which probably indicates that the contraction began, as in Arabic, with the part in which two hamzas came together. King Mēsha' also writes **ואמר**, "and I said," l. 24, **ואחזה** l. 11, 20, but **ואמר** l. 6, 14. The *ē* of the second radical, which becomes *a*, *ē* in current discourse or with retracted accent, **יֹאכֵל**, **יֹאמַר**, **יֹאפֶה**, extends through all these verbs, and similarly **אָחַז** makes **יֹאחֵז** and **יֹאחֶז**; **אָסַף**, **יֹאסֵף**, **יֹאסֶף**, **תֹּאסֵף** and **יֹאסֶף** (with omission of the א). In all these cases the broader prefix seems to have thinned the *u*, *ô* of the second radical to *ē*, *ē*, a vowel which the Hebrew imperfect usually avoids. Similar forms from stative verbs with imperfect *a* are **וָאָהַב**, Mal. i. 2, **וָיֹחֶר** (for **וָיֹאחֶר**), 2 Sam. xx. 5, *Kēre*; but beside these we find also **וָאָהַב**, Prov. viii. 17, **וָאָחַר**, Gen. xxxii. 5, and probably **וָיֹחֶר**, 2 Sam. xx. 5 *Kēthubh*, with similar forms from **אָתַה** and **אָוַל**. Those from the two last verbs may be mere Aramaisms; the others seem to be genuine Hebrew forms and may be compared with the dialectic Arabic **أَتَمَّ** from **تَشَمَّ**.

In the Aramaic imperfect (and inf.) the contraction into *e* (for *a*, *a'*, as in the particle **נָא** - **נָא'**, *na'*) is universal; Jewish Ar.

ܡܐܡܪ, inf. ܡܐܡܪ etc., Syr. ܡܐܡܪ. But in verbs imperfect *a* the West Syrians further thin *i* to *ɛ*; thus ܡܐܡܪ, ܡܐܡܪ are in the East *nêmar*, *mêmar*, but in the West *nîmar*, *mîmar*.

The Arabic imperative is necessarily ٱؤْمَرْ not ٱؤْمَلْ. Three verbs commonly reject the first radical, ٱؤْمَرْ, ٱؤْمَلْ, ٱؤْكَلْ, making ٱؤْمَرْ, ٱؤْمَلْ, ٱؤْكَلْ, whence in vulgar Arabic we even find the perfects *had* and *kal*. So from ٱؤْمَلْ we have ٱؤْمَلْ and ٱؤْمَلْ in pause ٱؤْمَلْ. A similar apocope takes place in Syriac in the imperatives ܡܠܐ "come" and ܡܠܐ "go".² Apart from these anomalous forms the only point to be noted about the Syriac imperative is that the full vowel necessarily assumed by the initial ܡ is *a* before *ɔ* but *e* before *α*, ܡܠܐ, ܡܠܐ—a distinction which does not appear to be carried out in the other dialects of Aramaic. In Biblical Aramaic and Targumic, as in Hebrew, a *hateph* commonly takes the place of a full vowel; yet we find in the Targums such forms as ܡܠܐ, ܡܠܐ, and even in Hebrew the plurals ܡܠܐ and ܡܠܐ. In the passive participle the Syriac has ܡܠܐ, but in Dan. iii. 22 we have ܡܠܐ.

In the reflexive of the simple stem the Arabic ٱؤْتَمَرْ, imperfect ٱؤْتَمَرْ, perf. pass. ٱؤْتَمَرْ, requires no explanation. But the verb ٱؤْتَمَرْ makes ٱؤْتَمَرْ, and so also we find ٱؤْتَمَرْ as well as ٱؤْتَمَرْ.

¹ But ٱؤْمَلْ and ٱؤْمَلْ and so forth. So also ٱؤْمَلْ as well as ٱؤْمَلْ, but ٱؤْمَلْ.

² Talm. B. ܡܠܐ, ܡܠܐ; but in Bibl. Aram. ܡܠܐ, Ezra v. 15 (in the Targums ܡܠܐ, Numb. xxii. 35, Compl., Bomb.); ܡܠܐ, Dan. iii. 26 (in the Targums ܡܠܐ, ܡܠܐ).

as well as **אֵיתַּבֵּר**, and more rarely a few other cases of the same kind. Similarly in Aramaic **אַתְּחַר**, **אַתְּבֵּר** with sporadic cases of the same kind in other verbs. The ordinary Syriac reflexive is **אַתְּבֵּר**, fem. **אַתְּבֵּר**, by the general rule of Syriac that **א** gives up its vowel to a vowelless consonant and disappears in pronunciation. In the Targums this elision seems not to take place and the forms are regular. In the intensive stem the **א** in Syriac also mostly surrenders its vowel and is elided after prefixes with a vanishing vowel: imperf. **נִאֲכַל** for *n'akkal* (1st person part. **נִאֲכַל**) part. **מִאֲכַל** etc. Similar forms are found, though less consistently, in Jewish Aramaic and occasionally in Hebrew, **וַתִּתְּנִי**, 2 Sam. xxii. 40, for **וַתִּתְּנִי**, Ps. xviii. 40, **מִלֵּךְ**, Job xxxv. 11, and so forth. In Aramaic the extensive stem (Aph'el and Shaph'el with their reflexives) passes wholly over into the forms of verbs **פִּי**, except in the two verbs **הִמְנֵן** and **סִפֵּף** and **הִתִּי**, **אִתִּי**, Palmyrene **אִתִּי**, De Vog. 15, l. 4, **אִתִּי**, where the **א** becomes **י**: compare the Hebrew imper. Hiph. **הִתִּי**, Jer. xii. 9, and the part. **מִתֵּן** "giving ear," Prov. xvii. 4. The Hebrew forms are generally regular, but in a few cases we find the contraction of **אֵ** into **אֶ**, as **אֶכֶּל**, Hosea xi. 4, and so in the Niphal **נִאֲכַל**, Numb. xxxii. 30, or even into **אֶ**, **וַיֵּאֶכֶל**, Numb. xi. 25, **וַיֵּרֶב**, 1 Sam. xv. 5. The passage of **א** into **י**, which plays so large a part in Syriac, is sometimes found also in the Arabic verb, but in a different connexion and mainly in the later language. Thus **اُتَّ** often becomes **اُتَّو**, **تَوَاعَرُوا** for **تَوَاعَرُوا** "they deliberated together," and so too initial **اُ** sometimes becomes **اُ** in stem III., **وَأَكَل** for **أَكَل**. In modern Egyptian Arabic we even find *wakkil* for **اَكَل**, perf. of **اَكَل** II.

B. *Verbs* נ"ע. In Ethiopic, Arabic and Hebrew the forms are generally strong throughout; and strong forms are also common in Eastern Syriac¹. But in Arabic these verbs are sometimes assimilated to hollow verbs, or, when the hamza begins a syllable and is preceded by a vowelless consonant, it is elided and throws back its vowel on the consonant before it. This happens mainly with the verb ^{سأل} "ask," from which we have such forms as ^{يسأل}, or more frequently, with elision, ^{يسل}. Similarly the common ^{يرى} for ^{يراي} "he will see," and a few others. In Western Syriac the elision of ^ا is the rule, whether at the beginning or end of a syllable, unless it stands between two full vowels; but the otiant letter is generally allowed to remain in writing; thus perf. Peal ^{قال} (E. Syr. ^{قال}), imperf. ^{يقال}, pl. ^{يقالون} (E. Syr. ^{يقالون}, pl. ^{يقالون}, where the subscript line denotes a kind of vocal *shewa*), Ethpe'el ^{قال} (E. Syr. ^{قال}), 1st pers. ^{قال}, and so forth. When the first or third radical is an aspirate we sometimes find forms like ^{قاف}, where the hardening of the aspirate represents an older doubling, presumably due to assimilation of the ^ا. In Biblical Aramaic the נ maintains itself, as in E. Syriac, and so apparently in the Targums. In the latter נ may pass into * when it is doubled, e.g. ^{שיר} Pa'el of ^{שיר}. So too many Syrians pronounced ^{כאף} as *bayesh*, and the verb ^{כאף} forms the Pa'el ^{כאף}; but in the latter case it is the form of the Pē'al that is secondary. The transition of verbs נ"ע to hollow verbs, of which we have found some examples in Arabic, prevails within the Aramaic field in

¹ See for the Syriac Nestle in *Beitr. zur Assyriologie*, i. 153 sqq. (where however in Nöldeke's judgment the case is overstated, and insufficient weight is given to the numerous instances in which the ancient Nestorian Massora (of A.D. 899) forbids the ^א to be pronounced). All Syriac verbs of this class are stative in form. In Hebrew the only cases of contraction are ^{נאני} pl. of the Pi'el ^{נאנה} (if this is not rather an old Niph'al from ^{אנה}) and possibly ^{נאני}, Eccles. xii. 5.

Mandaïtic. A transition to **ס״פ** sometimes occurs in Syriac, e.g. **ܣܢܦܐ**, **ܣܢܦܐ** (from **ܣܢܦܐ**), Ps. xli. 2; but most forms of this kind are only graphical errors.

C. *Verbs ס״ל*. Here the tendency of the languages, completely carried out in vulgar Arabic, and almost completely in Aramaic, is to entire assimilation with verbs **ס״ל**. In the intensive stem of a very few Syriac verbs a final **ܐ**, though it is no longer actually pronounced, retained its guttural force to so late a date that the forms are still **ܣܢܦܐ**, **ܣܢܦܐ**, **ܣܢܦܐ** (with *a* for *e* in the last syllable under the influence of the guttural), and are commonly inflected regularly, except that the **ܐ** throws back its vowel in forms like 3rd pl. perf. **ܣܢܦܐܐ** etc. In Hebrew alone do the **ס״ל** form a distinct class of weak verbs, the **ס** retaining its consonantal force whenever it has a vowel, **מַצֵּא**, **יִמְצֵא**, **יִמְצְאוּ**, or even a vocal *shēva*, **אִמְצֵא**, but being absorbed into the previous vowel when it closes a syllable. In a final syllable this absorption produces no change in the quality of the vowel, though it lengthens *a* to *ā*, **מַצֵּא**, stative **מֵצֵא**, imperf. **יִמְצֵא** (for *yimṣā*, with characteristic *a* before the guttural), Niph'al **נִמְצֵא**, **יִמְצֵא**. Hiph. **רִמְצֵא** etc. In the perfect of the simple stem the normal vowel is also retained in syllables not final **מַצֵּאת**, **מֵצֵאת**, but the other perfects in such cases uniformly take *ē* **נִמְצַאת**, **רִמְצַאת** etc. A similar law of uniformity prevails in all imperfects (so far as the few examples allow us to judge), but here the vowel is *seghol*; **תִּמְצְאנה**, **תִּמְצְאנה** etc. So also the imperf. of the simple stem **מַצֵּא**; in the derived stems there are no examples of the imperative with consonantal affix. If we compare these forms with the corresponding parts of verbs third guttural we see that the *ē* of the perfect and the *seghol* of the imperfect alike represent an older *ā*, and it seems most likely that the deflection to *ē*, *e*, has been produced under

the influence of verbs רָ"י. The two classes of verbs often run into one another, as may be seen from the lists of mixed forms in any Hebrew Grammar.

In what has been said above as to the treatment of radical א in Hebrew we have had to do with the stage of the language represented by the Massoretic pronunciation; but before we leave the subject it will be well to glance at the reasons, already alluded to on p. 278, for concluding that traces of a more primitive pronunciation are preserved in the spelling of the consonantal text. It is not doubtful that when Hebrew and the neighbouring Canaanite dialects were first committed to writing, spelling went by sound and not by etymology, so that א would not be written unless it was actually heard as a guttural. Let us first apply this consideration to ancient inscriptions, in which we are sure that we have the actual orthography of the first writers, untouched by subsequent correction. On the stele of Mēsha' we have רִשׁ, "head," רִית, "gazingstock," וְאָמַר "and I said," all with omission of a radical א which was already lost in pronunciation. But on the other hand we have מֵאֵתֶּן, וְיֵאמַר (Heb. מֵאֵתֶּן), צֹאן "sheep." The last example is particularly noticeable in contrast with רִשׁ; for while the spelling מֵאֵתֶּן might conceivably be aided by the singular מֵאֵת (l. 20) there was nothing to help the retention of the א in צֹאן unless it was actually sounded when this spelling was chosen. So again when the Phœnician writes בִּנְתָּ "I built" (*C. I. S.* 3, l. 4) but קִרְאתָ "I called" (*Ib.* 1, l. 7) we are certainly not justified by the rules of Phœnician spelling in taking the א to be merely the sign of the vowel *a*. When we pass from inscriptions to the Biblical texts we are met by the difficulty that the spelling has undergone later revision, especially by the insertion of vowel letters in cases where these were not used in old times. But א is not a mere *mater lectionis*; the rule that prevails is that א is inserted wherever it is etymologically justified, whether it is sounded or not, and the exceptions to this rule are merely sporadic, except in such cases as אָמַר for אֵמַר, where the

second נ must have lost its sound in very ancient times. It is incredible that any systematic correction of the orthography, by the lights that the later Hebrew scribes possessed, could have given us a system so correct etymologically as the Old Testament displays; and the same degree of correctness already appears on a small scale in the Siloam inscription (ראש, מוצא, מאתים) against Moabite and Phœnician (רש). The conclusion is inevitable that when Hebrew first came to be written to an extent sufficient to give a tolerably fixed orthography, radical נ still retained in most cases its guttural sound.]

ADDITIONAL NOTES AND CORRECTIONS.

- P. 3, l. 35. Since this was printed Prof. Kautzsch, now of Halle, has brought out the 25th edition of Gesenius' *Heb. Gr.* (Leipzig, 1889) with considerable additions and improvements.
- P. 7, l. 35. For 421 read 420.
- P. 12, *footnote*. Still later are the cursive tablets of the Arsacid period, some of which Strassmeier has published in *Zeitschr. f. Assy.* vol. iii. (1888) p. 129 *sqq.* One of these (p. 135) of the year 80 B.C. is, as Mr E. A. W. Budge kindly informs me, the latest example of the Assyrian writing of which we have certain knowledge.
- P. 17. The Aramaic inscriptions will form the second part of the great Paris Corpus. The first fasciculus, edited by M. de Vogüé, has appeared (Paris, 1889).
- P. 20, l. 10. For 1865 read 1855.
- Ibid.*, *footnote* 1. Further information about the dialect of Ma'lûlâ is given by Mr F. J. Bliss in the *Qu. Statement of the Pal. Expl. Fund*, April, 1890, p. 74 *sqq.*
- P. 25, *footnote*. The text of the inscription, in Hebrew square characters, with translation and notes, is given in Prof. Driver's *Notes on . . . Samuel* (Oxf. 1890), p. lxxxv *sqq.*
- P. 29, *footnote*. A substantial addition to our stock of dated Himyaritic inscriptions is promised by E. Glaser from the epigraphic collections formed during his journeys in S. Arabia.
- P. 34. In *Zeitschr. f. aegypt. Spr. u. Alterthumsk.* 1889, p. 81, Erman has indicated the existence in Egyptian of a tense precisely corresponding to the Semitic Perfect. (Nöld.) The forms of the singular and plural are as follows –

SING.		PLUR.
3m.	ḥbs	3. ḥbsw
3f.	ḥbsti'	
2m.	ḥbsti'	2c. ḥbstīnī
1.	ḥbskwi' (cf. Aeth. -kū)	1. ḥbswīn

- P. 35. For the history of Semitic, and especially of Hebrew, writing the student will do well to consult the introduction to Prof. Driver's *Notes on . . . Samuel*, Oxf. 1890 (with facsimiles).
- P. 40, *footnote*. It should be stated that the quotation at the close of this note is from Prof. Müller's article "Yemen" in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. His paper in the Vienna *Denkschriften*, which had not reached England when the note was printed, deals with the Minaean inscriptions of Euting's collection, of which the dialect and character are S. Arabian, and with one group of inscriptions of N. Arabian type, which, on the ground of their contents, are called Lihyānite. A large number of inscriptions, provisionally classed together as Proto-Arabic, are reserved for future publication. Thus it is not yet possible to say anything definitive about the history of the old Arabian alphabets; the materials already published have given rise to lively controversy.
- P. 44, l. 24. Prof. Nöldeke observes that the form derived from *sham'al^{um}* by elision of *ʾ* would be *shamal^{um}*, not *shamāl^{um}*. The latter therefore must be derived from a secondary form *sham'āl^{um}*; cf. the Hebrew and Aramaic forms.
- P. 48, l. 15. See p. 51, *footnote* 1.
- P. 48, l. 21. Prof. Nöldeke "cannot recognise the weakening or loss of *y* in any one of the three cases adduced. In *מתאב* the change of *y* to *x* has been deliberately introduced to change the sense" [Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebers.* p. 349], "*בל* is Babylonian, and that *בי* stands for *בעי* is improbable." There are, however, other probable examples of the occasional weakening of *y* in Hebrew, notably *פתאם* side by side with *פתע*. Such readings as *נשקה* for *נשקעה*, Amos viii. 8, *למו* for *לעמו*, Ps. xxviii. 8 (LXX. τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ), are probably due to a pronunciation in which *y* was not sounded; but to ascribe this vicious pronunciation to the original writers is not justifiable; the readings in question are presumably errors of later scribes.
- P. 51, l. 5. "In many parts of Syria *ç* seems to be pronounced like the French *j*"—(Nöld.). In upper Egypt one sometimes hears a pronunciation intermediate between English hard and soft *g*, but nearly approaching the latter. In Arabia *ç* is hard in Nejd, and soft (*g* in *gem*) in the Hījāz (Mecca, Tāif).

- P. 58, l. 4. This paragraph and those that follow it should be read in the light of p. 41, where the author takes it to be probable that the proto-Semitic had three sibilants besides *z* and *s*. All three appear distinct in Hebrew as שׁ, שׂ and ס respectively; but in later times the sounds of שׂ and ס were so much alike that the one was sometimes written for the other. In Syriac (but not in the oldest Aramaic; see p. 74 footnote) שׂ has been absorbed in ס (ܫ); in Arabic, on the contrary, the primitive sound represented by Hebrew שׂ remains distinct (as ش), while the other two old sounds (שׁ, ס) are both represented by س. For an attempt to work out the history of the Semitic sibilants see D. H. Müller, *Zur Gesch. d. Sem. Zischlaute*, Vienna, 1888 (from the *Abhandlungen* of the 7th International Congress of Orientalists, Sem. Sect., p. 229 sqq.).
- P. 73, l. 9 sqq.; and p. 256, l. 16. Prof. Nöldeke observes that the distinction between تِلَا and بَكِي cannot be regarded as the invention of the grammarians, inasmuch as it was carefully observed by the writers of the oldest copies of the Kor'an. These scribes, he believes, made a distinction in pronunciation between اُ and ع; we know indeed that many Kor'an teachers pronounced ع with *Imāla*. See *Geschichte des Qorāns*, p. 252 sqq.
- P. 94, l. 14. For ܐܬܝܢܐܠܝܟܡ read ܐܬܝܢܐܠܝܚܡ.
- P. 100, l. 17. Prof. Nöldeke remarks that to connect ܫܕܪܐ with ܫܕܪܐ appears to be inadmissible, since to do so involves *two* irregularities (Hebrew שׂ should correspond to Arabic س), and that ܫܕܪܐ is a mere transcription of the Arabic بطيخ. The genuine Syriac form is ܫܕܪܐ.

THE END.

Date Due

Nov 20 '74

PJ

12312

Wright, William

Lectures on the comparative grammar
of the Semitic languages, from
the papers of the late William
Wright.

